028

2.11.

JOURNAL OF DAKKAN HISTORY AND CULTURE

Vol. I. No. 2

PUBLISHED BY

The Dakkan History Association

HYDERABAD-DECCAN

1951

JOURNAL OF
DAKKAN HISTORY AND CULTURE

Vol. I. **April 1951** **No. 2**

Editor: M. RAMA RAO M.A., PH.D., B.ED.

46

PUBLISHED
BY

The Dakkan History Association

HYDERABAD-DECCAN

1951

Annual Subscription Rs. 10/-

V216m N51
N51.1.2

CONTENTS.

			Page
Rg. Veda and the Velocity af light– Prof. R. Krishnamurthi M. A.	...	...	115–118
The Porojas– G. Rama Das B. A.	...	...	119–128
The Gangakhed Collection– R. M. Joshi M. A.	...	...	129–132
The Kākatīyas of Warangal– Dr. M. Rama Rao M. A., Ph. D.	...	...	133–189
The Qutb Shahs– A. M. Siddiqui M. A.	...	...	190–196

191661
-600 003

ṚG-VĒDA AND THE VELOCITY OF LIGHT

PROF. R. KRISHNAMURTHI M. A.

There is a mantra ([1]) in the Rig-veda which reads:-

उद्वयं तमसस्परि ज्योति ष्पश्यन्त उत्तरम्
देवं देवत्रा सूर्यमगन्म ज्योति रुत्तमम् ।

Wilson's translation of this mantra reads "Beholding the up springing light above the darkness, we approach the divine Sun among the gods, the excellent light." The prose order is "Udvayam Tamas-aspari Dēvaṁ Devatra Sūryaṁ Agaṅma Jyōtir-Uttamaṁ - Jyotiṣ - Pasyaṅta Uttaraṁ." I translate it as "we get the Sūrya after night, Dēva of Dēvas, shedder of wavy rays of light, FIRST (Uttamaṁ) as opposed to Uttaraṁ, the light is seen. "Agaṅma Jyōtir" means serpent - like rays of light. "Aga" means a serpent, which may convey the idea of the wave motion of light and the motion of light along a straight line. The meaning of the word "Uttamaṁ" must be taken as an antonym to "Uttaraṁ" which means 'later' as in "Pūrva-Uttara". If the light were instantaneous then there is no necessity to say that the sun rises first and that its light is seen later. This mantra is recited during mid-day meditation every day.

1. Mr. G. V. Raghava Rao, B. A., B. L., of Yellamancheli, drew my attention to a Smriti mentioned by Sāyanāchārya, in his Rig-Veda Bhāshya (1-50-4). The quotation states that light travels 2,202 *yōjanas* in half a *nimēṣa*. By converting the ancient time-unit to modern time-units and the ancient length unit into modern length-units he showed that the velocity of light, as given by the ancients, was a very close approximation to the modern values. I was very much impressed by his explanation and wanted to verify the whole thing by myself. When I read the whole sūkta containing 18 ṛks and their meaning, I was amazed to find that the ancient Ṛṣis described the astronomical phenomenon of refraction and also the phenomenon of light travelling with an enormous velocity and that the Smṛti, quoted by Sāyana gives the velocity of light, which is almost equal to the present-day value

In the same sūkta there is another mantra :—

तरणि र्विश्वदर्शतो ज्योतिष्कृदसि सूर्य। विश्वमाभासि रोचनम् ॥

This means 'Thou Surya, source of light! your light travels with the greatest speed in making all things visible; thou shinest through out the entire firmament." Wilson's translation is 'Thou, Surya, out-strippest all in speed; thou art visible to all; thou art the source of light; thou shinest through out the entire firmament." This translation is unacceptable because, it is stated with one voice in all the Indian astronomical works that all planets, including the sun, move with the same velocity along their orbits, but as the orbits are at different distances from the earth, the observed times of complete revolution are different. If the motion is taken to mean the daily motion of the sun, then all celestial bodies move from east to west in twenty-four hours; hence the rate of motion will be the same for all and it cannot be said that theSun "outstrippest" all.

The word "Taraṇir" in the mantra comes from the root "Tṛ" which means 'to fly rapidly'. The sun's light is said to fly rapidly, because it travels with a velocity of 186,000 miles or 300,000 kilo-metres per second. In explaining the above mantra (1-50-4 R. V.), S'āyanācarya says :—

हे सूर्य त्वं तरणिः तरिता अन्येन गन्तुमशक्यस्य महतो अध्वनो गन्ता असि तथा च स्मर्यते – योजनानां सहस्र द्वे द्वे शते द्वे च योजने एकेन निमिषार्धेन क्रममाण नमो ऽ स्तुते ।

S'āyanācarya explains 'Taraṇim' as going so fast that no one else could go faster. He quotes a verse from a Smṛti to say that light travels 2,202 yōjanas in half a nimēṣa. If we could get the length of the yōjana in modern miles and the value of Nimēṣa in modern seconds, we could have an idea as to what the ancient Ṛṣis of India taught about the velocity of light.

According to the Purāṇas, 15 Nimēṣas make one Kāṣṭa; 30 Kāṣṭas make one Kalā; 30 Kalās make one Muhūrta; 30 Muhūrtas make one day and 360 days make one Year.[3] This gives 15 x 30 x 30 x 30 x 360 Nimēṣas for one Year. In the western system we have 365.25 days for one year; one day is equal to 24 hours; one hour is equal to 60

Burgess—*Sūryasidhdhanta* p. 6.

minutes; and one minute is equal to 60 seconds. The number of seconds in a year is equal to $60 \times 60 \times 24 \times 365.25$. We get 145,800,000 Nimēshas equal to 31,557,600 seconds. According to all ancient Indian works on mathematics 24 Angulas make one Cubit; 4 Cubits make one Daṇḍa or Nṛ or Lance-length; 2,000 Daṇḍas make one Krōs'a and four Krōs'as make one Yōjana. Therefore 768,000 Angulas make one Yōjana. As 24 Angulas which make one Cubit are equal to modern 18 inches, we get 576,000 inches equaling one Yōjana. Hence one Yōjana becomes 100/11 miles. So light travels $2,202 \times 100/11$ miles in 5844/27,000 seconds. This when converted into miles gives 185,000 miles per second, approximately. On account of this velocity of light, the sun appears to rise on the horizon $8\frac{1}{2}$ minutes later than his actual rise i. e. the sun's rays reach us $8\frac{1}{2}$ minutes after he rises in the east. Readers may feel curious to know, how the ancients were able to measure time accurately when they had no watches to give them the accurate second. The ancients made use of sound to measure time. 864,000 Akṣara sounds constituted a Saura Day i. e. 360th part of a year. The number of Akṣaras in the Ṛg Vēda is the same as the number of akṣaras in a day. Thus the Ṛg Vēda repetition served the purpose of a stop-watch. The stop watch can measure a second of time, which is 86,400th part of a mean solar day whereas one akṣara is the 864,000th part of a day. Thus the ancients possessed a more accurate time-measurer also.

That light has a velocity was first guessed by Galileo but it was Romer who first declared in 1675 A. D., that its velocity must be 300,000 kilometres or 186,000 miles per second. His contemporaries would not believe him. His contention was, fifty years later, conclusively established by Bradley, who was working on the astronomical phenomenon of Aberration. Later Fizeau and Focault demonstrated the value experimentally. Finally Michelson made the experiment more accurate and determined the velocity of light to within a few kilometres i. e. 299,796, kilometres per second.

The Ṛṣi Praskaṇva also refers to the phenomenon of astronomical Refraction in the opening mantra of the same sūkta (R. V. 1-50-1). The Rik reads:

उदु त्यं जातवेदसं देवं वहन्ति केतवः दृशे विश्वाय सूर्यम् ।

The pada-pāṭha is "Ut Uṁ Tyaṁ Jātavēdasaṁ Devaṁ Vahanti Kētavaḥ Drisē Viswāya Sūryaṁ". It means that the rays of the sun shoot up the divine sun, the all-knowing that he may be seen by all. This is referred to as "Kuvāyu-cēṣta" in our pañcānga.

THE POROJAS

G. RAMADAS, B. A.

Poroja, the name of the tribe, has been mis-understood by the previous writers on Ethnology. It is supposed to be the mutilated form of Praja, which means 'inhabitants' or 'sons'. Western writers apply this word to the Gadabas and other tribes associated with them. Poroja is the name of a distinct tribe just as the Savaras, the Gadabas, the Qui, the Santals and others. This tribe is homogeneous; but by association with other tribes and with the cultured classes from the plains the tribe shows modifications in both physical appearence and customs. They still religiously observe such customs which are found either mentioned in Sanskrit literature or exhibited in the feature and ornaments of the images found in ancient structures. Such relics of customs will be pointed out in this paper as occasion arises.

They seem to have had a language of their own which they had forgotten on account of the association for centuries with cultured classes. Relics of their forgotten language can be picked up from the home talk or the songs of the people-e. g.-Puṭṭra (a stream), Kanda (a child), Sala (region) as in Kū-sala, the place around the well. 'Pa' is pronounced as 'ha'. There is a marked peculiarity in their intonation of Oriya. The Porojas seem to have been inhabiting the Vizagapatam Agency from about the 2nd century of the Christian era, if not before. The words Kanda, Sala occur in the inscriptions of Amarāvati, dated about the 2nd Century A. D. In an inscription in the Temple of Danteswari at Dantawara, Bastar State, which on paleaographical evidence can be assigned to the 9th century A. D., the region of Nandapur, the centre of the Nandapur State of the 14th Century A. D., is said to have been located in Gond-mandala, the province of the Gonds. A king of the Kalachuri family (Central India) bought a piece of land from a Poroja at Borigumma and gave it to god Bhairava at that place.

The Parēng Poroja :—This clan eats beef. The women wear ornaments all made of brass. Garlands of small brass beads are worn round the neck and brass rings on the lower arms. The peculiar distinguishing ornament is a triangular brass wire which sits astride on the saddle of the nose, its apex projecting upwards to the middle of the two brows.

Village Life :—Every village is enclosed by a fence in which a gap is left to serve as an entrance. Houses are built in two or more rows with a broad space between them. Each house contains a store room, a kitchen, a sleeping apartment, a cow shed and a drinking apartment. All these are built separately and are enclosed by a wall or fence. In one place of the wall is left a gateway.

Two houses are built separately. In each row of houses there will be one for the grown up maidens of the village to sleep in and another for the unmarried young men. The maidens are responsible for keeping their sleeping house neat and tidy and are under the control of a head who is also a maiden and who attains that position by common consent. Similarly the young men are responsible for keeping their sleeping apartment tidy and are under the control of a head young man. After nightfall none of the maidens is allowed to come out, nor is any young man permitted to do so. Flirtations occur nevertheless. The villagers are under the control of a head man who is nominated by all the villagers and approved by the Zamindar. At times the headman may be appointed by the Zamindar himself and the villagers have to accept him. In the middle of the village is planted a banyan or a mango tree. Round the foot of the trunk a platform surmounted by stone slabs is raised. This serves as a seat for the headman when he sits in court to hear and decide disputes. Whenever a dispute arises in the village, he summons all the villagers and they come and sit before him. Women also attend but remain standing. When all men are assembled, the headman takes his seat on the platform and the question is discussed. The decision of the assembly is binding on all.

Marriage :- Generally the young man selects the woman he likes to marry and informs his parents who

carry on negotiations with the parents of the selected maiden. If the maiden's parents do not approve the match fails. A day previous to the appointed one, the bridegroom lurks along with some of his friends in a place by the side of which the maiden is expected to pass alone. He then pounces on her and with the help of his friends carries her away to his home. But the maid's parents hearing of it go with friends to her relief. A small mock fight ensues between the two parties and when every one is exhausted, they all go to the bridegroom's house where they are served with food and drink.

A pandal is raised in front of the bride-groom's house and the marriage ceremony is performed in it. After bathing with safron water, the bride and bridegroom wear new clothes and sit on a raised platform in the centre. Then all the women gather round the pair and sing songs. Drums of several kinds such as Dōl, Kettle-Drum, Taṁker, Dōlak, and Ḍappu are beaten at the time of the marriage. The chief musical instrument is a single stringed Ektar, which is called Ḍwḍuṅga by the Porojas.

Ektar is the mendicants' drone. A round stick, usually of bamboo, about 4 ft. in length and less than 2 inches in diameter, forms the finger-board. One end of this stick is provided with a tuning peg and the other end is passed through a hollow gourd resonator. It has an open string, one end of which is fastened to a nail fixed on to the projection of the stick beyond the resonator. From here the string passes over a crude wooden bridge placed on the gourd and then fastened to the peg at the top. To increase the richness of tone, a silken or woolen thread is placed between the bridge and the string. The instrument is held either in the right-hand or the left and the fore-finger is used to pluck the string. The instrument is sometimes decorated with peacock feathers, couries and bright copper coins which are fixed on to the gourd by wax. This is tuned by the young man keeping time to the song he sings; while he sings Poroja damsels stand round him dancing and singing along with the songster.

Abduction: The children are usually named after the week-day on which they are born. When a woman living with her husband, is allured away by another man, the

husband with the help of the head-man of the village sends a man to search for her. After finding her abode, the emissory reaches the house at dusk, pulls off some thatch from the roof and sits in the front of the house burning the thatch till dawn. Then he returns to the head of his village and gives information regarding the woman's whereabouts. After sometime, the village headman, and aggrieved husband, accompanied by the leaders of the surrounding villages proceed in single file led by a man who beats kettle-drum or Tomoca. They all arrive at the village and halt in a garden near by. From there, they summon the abductor to a fight. In olden days, before the advent of the British such fights of might were taking place but now a days the affair is settled by negotiation. The adbductor pays a price for the woman if she does not like to go back to her former husband. Part of the price money is spent for a dinner in which both parties partake.

Amongst the Porojas, there are many totems like Bāg (tiger); Nāg (serpent); Phulu (flower); Goru (cow); and Mach (fish). The Poroja does'nt kill or eat the thing that is the emblem of his totem. The Poroja of the Phulu totem does not wear flowers; one of the fish totem does not eat fish. Persons of the same totem may not marry. Nor may the children of a brother and a sister or of brothers. Widow remarriage is allowed. It is compulsory for a widow to marry her late husband's younger brother. If she does not wish to do so the man she marries must pay compensation to that younger brother. Divorces are permitted; if a woman does not like her husband she will pay him five rupees and go away from him; but a husband leaving his wife pays her only one rupee. If the woman while living with one man goes to another, the new one must pay her husband a sum of money fixed by the elders of the village. The children, if she has any, are retained by the man to whom she bore them.

Death Ceremonies: When a man or a woman dies in a family, the corpse is taken to a place outside the village, all the men and women following. The corpse is either burnt or buried. They all bathe in an adjoining river or pond and take along with them a flat long stone and set it upright just outside the village and place a flat slab at

its foot. A small rag is tied round the middle of the upright stone and a bamboo, the top of which is split and formed into a trident, is placed behind the vertical stone. Offerings of food and fowls are made on the flat stone at the foot of the vertical one generally on the third and the tenth days. On the tenth day, after nightfall, food and other offerings are prepared and a man carries them to a place halfway to the cremation or burial ground. He plases them there and calls by name on the soul of the dead man. Then one of those that carried the corpse on the first day is possessed by that soul and he issues out of the darkness sounding his tangi on a hoe. Every time the departed soul is called upon by beating a hoe with a tangi the man possessed responds with a grunt. He is led to the house wherein the death occurred. In the house geometrical figures are made with flour and three grains are placed in the middle of those drawings and a pot put over them. The drawings are of Yama, Saturn and the devil. The possessed man enters the house and kicks away the pot and discovers the grains. If they are found on the drawings of Yama, it is understood that the soul was taken away by Yama or the god of death and if the seeds are discovered on the Saturn drawings by Sani or Saturn. It is believed that the soul became a devil, if the seeds are found on the devil drawings.

Gods and Festivals:—At the entrance of the village, under a tree is kept the god called the Nis'āṇ-dēvatā. It is a small oval stone installed on an auspicious day even before the village is formed. Over it stones are piled up in the form of a temple. It is believed that this Nis'āṇ-dēvatā protects the village from epidemics, wild animals and other dangers.

In the middle of the village under a shed is kept the goddess named Ṭhākurāṇī. This is represented by some wooden images under a shed. Near the foot of a hill, is installed another goddess named *Jhākar dēvatā*. This is also a female. She is the protector of the crops.

In addition to these, the Tiger goddess is propitiated by offerings of sacrifices in the mountain caves. All the villagers go to the cave, prepare food and kill a goat or a buffalo and offer them all to the Tiger goddess; they

then drink liquor and dance to the accompaniment of drums till nightfall and return to the village. It is believed that as a result of this offering the tiger will not molest the villagers during the year.

The Porojas hold feasts to propitiate all the gods. In the month of Chaitra they hold the hunting feast and all the men retire into the forest for a hunt. None of the party should return without an animal. The women in the village decorate themselves in their finest and spend the time in dance and play. Young maidens are wooed at this time and the selection of brides made. When it is reported that an animal has been killed, the women of the village proceed to the edge of the forest and await the arrival of the men. The carcass, decorated with garlands of flowers and peacock feathers, is carried on a litter carried on men's shoulders and the women sing and dance in front to the beat of drums. The procession goes to the village where the carcass is flayed and quartered. The flesh is divided amongst all the villagers. Another festival is the Nuākhya or eating the new harvest. This takes place in the month of 'Bondā Paṇi' i. e., Śrāvaṇam of the Indian Calendar. The leaves of the growing paddy plat and its roots are cooked together, offered to all the gods and enjoyed along with other dishes and liquor.

The Puṣ festival:—This is held on the full moon day of the month of Puṣya. A buffalo is killed in the name of all village gods, and feasting, drink and dance last the whole day. This is done on the day before the full moon. On the full moon night young damsels go singing from house to house and receive doles of rice at every door. The rice thus collected is all cooked on the fire lit in the centre of the village in the early dawn of the day. After sunrise all bathe, wear new clothes and feast.

Witchcraft and Sorcery:—The Disāri or the village priest knows astronomy, medicine, witchery and sorcery. Whenever a man or a woman or a child falls ill, the Poroja consults his village Disāri. At first he gives some herbs but if the illness is not cured, he comes to the house of the patient and then sits in a room alone. After a few minutes he falls, and goes into a trance for some time. When incense is burnt before him, he sits up and speaks as if possessed. In that state he gives out the cause of the

illness and ascribes it to the existence of bones in a cornor of the house, or to failure to propitiate a god or to the sorcery of an enemy of the patient or his parents.

He proposes to remove the cause on some future day and orders the head of the family to keep ready certain things for that day. On the appointed day, the Disāri again goes to the patient's house and burning incense, recites some prayers in a tone and intonation deemed peculiarly suited to the occasion. Then after some time, if the ascribed cause was the presence of bones under the floor of the house, he goes to that corner and digs out the bones and presents them. If illness be due to a devil, he ties a talisman round the neck of the patient; if it be due to sorcery, he puts some food, red and yellow cooked rice, in a bamboo dish with a light in the middle and the whole thing is taken out of the house and left where two roads cross.

He is also capable of doing evil to others either of hit own accord or at instigation. He goes to a certain plan which grows into a small shrub and binds all its branches together, Then holding the whole shrub in his hands he mutters a prayer to the effect that a particular man should fall ill. He then bends the shrub to a side and places a stone over it. The man falls ill; if the stone is removed and the branches are freed he gets better. If the sorcerer wishes to extinguish life he plucks the shrub and flings it away. As it drys and decays, the person also dies gradually. A man is made to swell up by means of a frog. A big frog is caught in a brook and its entrails removed. Some cooked food is placed in its stomach and it is sewn in a cloth and buried in a place where two roads cross. Then the body of the person in whose name it is done, will swell up. If the buried thing is removed and thrown away, he recovers his health. If the sorcerer wishes that the person should die, the frog is left untouched. Many kinds of sorcery are practiced. The most efficacious of them is the little finger sorcery. When a stillborn child is buried, the sorcerer goes to the grave at dead of night and takes out the body. Instilling life into it he asks it to give the little finger of the right hand. The child speaks and permits the sorcerer to cut it. Having cut it, he removes the life of the child and buries it again. This little finger he uses for many purposes. He sends it to any place he

likes and obtains through it any thing he wishes. He can kill a man or cure a patient with it. Every one in the village and also in the surrounding villages is terrified of a sorcerer possessing this finger. The Disāri knows the names of the constellations and the planets. He makes calculations, foretells evil or good. The month is lunar and all festivals are fixed within five days either before or after the full moon. The auspicious day for performing a marriage is fixed by the Disāri. He officiates as the priest at marriages and ties the nuptial knot. His presence is required at village assemblies and his advice solicited on all matters.

THE GANGAKHED COLLECTION

R. M. JOSHI M. A.

The Hyderabad Central Records Office, till recently styled the Daftar-e Diwani, Mal & Mulki, has been able to acquire a large collection of Marathi documents from Shrimathi Sita Bai, Rani of Gangakhed, as a loan collection. The Central Record Office has in its possession a large number of papers classified as Poona Akhbars. These are important news letters despatched from Poona by the agents of the Nizam working under Dhondoji Shankar and Nanaji Shankar, the clever diplomats, under whom worked Haibat Rao Gopal, the primogenitor of the family of the Jagirdars of Gangakhed. Dhondoji Shankar and Nanaji Shankar, were the ancestors of the Rai Rayans. A paper was read by me giving in a synoptical form, a cursory view of the contents of these news letters at the Deccan History Conference held in 1946. The loan collection from Gangakhed has proved complementary to the collection that the Department had in its own possession. The Gangakhed collection has got principally news-letters relating to the post--Kharda period -i. e- from after February 1795. This collection has got some intersting anecdotes relating to the political personalities of the day in addition to some daily reports about the Asafjahs, some statements of accounts and miscellaneous documents. Some of the news-letters from Poona give a detailed description regarding the death of Madhav Rao II owing to the fall on the fountain in the yard of his palace from the first floor drawing room of the Peshwa. There is a great controversy as to whether Madhav Rao II had purposely thrown himself from the first-floor to end his life or whether it was an unconscious fall due to delirious condition. Some of the letters in this collection are unique among the published sources of the Maratha history, as details recorded in them, are interesting and vivid. These news-letters will no doubt be published as supplementary volumes to the collections officially in the possession of the Central Records

but before that a summary of one of such letters is here given to acquaint such of the readers and scholars as are interested in Deccan History.

In an Akhbar despatched on 12th Rabilakhar 1210 A. H. corresponding to 25th October 1795 it has been stated that "the Panta Pradhan fell from the first-floor of the Ganapati Mahal below on the fountain in the yard and had a fracture in the thigh and the fore-arm. His mouth and the teeth also sustained serious injuries, lips have been pierced and a piece of bone has been thrown out. A physician was sent for. The Peshwa was being treated by the physician when nobody except Balaji Pant was allowed to be present. Later Tukoji Holkar also joined him. The Panta Pradhan is still retaining his consciousness but does not talk to anybody regarding anything. A great problem is regarding his diet. He can not be given anything of wheat even in liquid form due to fever while rice would cause pus in the wound. It seems the Panta Pradhan due to biliousness and the evil effect on the brain is not able to say anything coherently. All the courtiers and Mutasaddis have been shocked to find the Peshwa in such a critical situation. They say if a period of 5½ days elapses the danger zone may be passed. Balaji Pant distributed alms on the 12th of Rabilakhar on account of the Peshwa's survival after the accident. Balaji Pant had posted pickets to receive information regarding the Peshwa from hour to hour. He paid constant visits to the palace. Ramachandra Rao Phadake, Laxman Rao Phadake and Madhava Rao Phadake have been constantly waiting at the bedside. While Appa Balwant and Chintaman Rao Phadake are anxiously moving to keep the people well posted regarding the improving condition of the Peshwa. Raghopant Godbole is in charge of maintaining peace and and order throughout the city. It is said that Doulat Rao Scindia, Raghoji Bhonsle and Parshuram Pant Mirajkar have been sent for. They say Raghoji Bhonsle is camping near the River Sina at Nimbgaon. When the news regarding the fall of the Panta Pradhan came to the knowledge of the merchants in the Aditwarpeth the shops were closed by them immediately. For the present it seems a great calamity has been averted". This long letter makes tragic reading when we remember how not withstanding the

optimism of the Letter-writer Madhava Rao II passed away on the next day.

Below are given three specimens from the collection of anecdotes discovered in the Gangakhed Collection.

Once Govind Krishna Kale, the Vakil of the Peshwa posted in Hyderabad accompanied Arstujah who had gone to pay a visit to a holy tomb where Nawab Nizam Ali Khan Bahadur also had arrived. The Nizam after offering his homage to the shrine distributed alms to several beggars loitering in the yard. Mashirun-mulk asked Govinda Rao Kale sardonically as to whether his own master, the Peshwa, ever distributed such sums to beggars. Govinda Rao Kale retorted as follows :–

"How happy would the Peshwa have been to display his generosity by distributing alms, but unfortunately beggars are conspicuous by their absence in Poona".

The second anecdote also deals with a repartee between Govind Rao Kale and Arstujah. Govind Rao Kale was taken to the bath-room by Mashirun-mulk to be shown a portrait of Madhav Rao II hung there. Mashirun-mulk Bahadur asked Govind Rao Kale as to whether that was not an appropriate place for the portrait of his master to be hung upon which Govind Rao Kale flung a reply in the following way :–

"It seems as though the presence of the portrait is an indispensable thing for the smooth discharge of nature's call".

The third anecdote again deals with the court of Mashirun-mulk. Chanda was a certain dancing girl who was well known during these days as an influential courtesan who had captivated the hearts af several political personalities by her enchanting loveliness. It seems on one occassion she had presented herself in a drawing room in the palace of Mashirun-mulk. While making her appearance, by oversight a pair of her shoes got entangled in her *dupatta* and lay exposed in the darbar when she sat on the well-carpeted floor. Nawab Bhiramud Dowllah who

was surprised to find a beautiful pair of shoes with fine brocade lying by her side asked the courtesan whether she had begun to carry her "JODA" (that is a pair of shoes or her loving consort) along with her wherever she went. Chanda no doubt felt a little shy for the occurence of the mishap and replied in a quibble as follows:-

"Well Sir, there is no wonder that I should be obliged to carry my "JODA" (meaning thereby her companion or consort) wherever I went because after all I am attached to various persons as their beloved. But she added that she was always shocked to find the "JODA" of many Sardars (meaning either a pair of shoes or a consort) being carried even by their personal attendants under their arms.

THE KĀKATĪYAS OF WARANGAL

(Continued from Vol. I-i, p. 90)

Dr. M. RAMA RAO M. A., Ph. D., B. Ed.

VI. BĒTA I. 1000-1030 A. D.

Bēta I, the first known king of the Kākatīya dynasty, became the ruler of a small independent principality about 1000 A. D. Two events of his reign are known from inscriptions of a later date viz- his being instituted as ruler over the Koṟavi country and his fight with the Cōḷa armies.

An inscription from Gūḍūr [118] in the Nizam's Dominions contains interesting information regarding the circumstances under which Bēta became the ruler of Koṟavi. It is stated therein that a certain Eṟṟa of the Viryāla family, an ornament among Maṇḍalikas, took up the cause of Bēta, killed his enemy in a battle and set him up as ruler over Koṟavi. Eṟṟa's wife, Kāmasāni, is said to have made this Bēta the *Kākati-vallabha* and preserved the house of Kākati.

The Viryāla family thus played a prominent part in the rise of the Kākatīyas to political importance. Eṟṟa is described as an ornament among feudatories but it is not stated whose feudatory he was. Similarly, his father Bhīma is said to have been a slayer of kings though his enemies are not mentioned [119]. Still, it appears as though this Bhīma fought with a number of people and rose into prominence while his son Eṟṟa attained the status of a feudatory. This resembles closely the progress of the Kākatīya family under Kākartya Guṇḍyana and his ancestors. The Gūḍūr inscription mentions three generations while the C. P. grant of Ammarāja's time [120] also mentions three generations of Guṇḍyana's family. The Kākatīyas are described as members of the Durjaya clan in some records while in others Durjaya figures as one of their early ancestors. According to the Gūḍūr inscription, mentioned above, the

118. *Tel. Ins.* Kak. No. 55.

119. *Ibid.* Verse. 2.

120. MER. c. p. No. 1. of 1916-17.

Viryāla family also belonged to the *Durjayakula*[121]. Thus, Guṇḍyana and Bēta of the Kākatīya family and Bhīma and Erra of the Viryāla family were kinsmen. Both the houses also seem to have risen to prominence at the same time and under the same circumstances. It may therefore, be supposed that both the families took advantage of the disorders that prevailed during the days of the civil war between Cāḷukya Bhīma and Yuddhamalla. As stated already Guṇḍyana was the feudatory ruler of Natavāḍi in the time of Ammarāja II. It is likely that his kinsmen of the Viryāla family held the Koravi-Gūḍūr region lying farther west as feudatories of the same king. Ammarāja died in a civil war with Bādapa under tragic circumstances. The Rāṣṭrakūṭas entered Vēngī once again and there was great confusion. Bādapa ultimately triumphed and ascended the Vēngī throne but he ruled over a much reduced territory. It is likely that the Kākatīya and Viryāla families, like many other local chieftains in Natavāḍi and Koravi, gave up their allegiance to the Vēngī Cāḷukyas and became independent during this period. The fall of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas in 973 A. D. might have also served these chieftains as an encouraging factor.

The reign of Bādapa, the usurper, ended, like that of Ammarāja, in confusion and civil war in 999 A. D. The Gūḍūr inscription depicts a chaotic condition in which an intense struggle seems to have been prevailing. Śaktivarman, son of Ammarāja's half brother, Dānārṇava, invaded Vēngī and opposed Bādapa[122]. The Cōḷas of South India are known to have despatched an expedition through the Vēngī country about this time to the north[123]. It is likely that the Cāḷukyan feudatories on the eastern border took advantage of these troubles and began a struggle for existence and expansion among themselves. Probably, Guṇḍyana was dead by this time and his family became, as a consequence, involved in troubles. An enemy, whose name is not known, seems to have ousted the Kākatīya family from its seat. At this critical juncture Erra, of the Viryāla family, came to the rescue of his kinsman Bēta of the Kākatīya family, killed his enemy

121. *Tel. Ins.* Kak. No. 55 Verse 1.

122. See his Pabhubarru grant in *jour. Tel. Ac.* II. P. 399.

123. Nilakanta Sastri. - *The cōlas* I. p. 219.

and set him up as the ruler of a small territory round Koṟavi called the Kōṟavidēśamu. Not content with this, Eṟṟa is said to have killed a Kāḍayanāyaka and subjugated a certain Ravvanṛpa of Vēlupugoṇḍa [124]. These exploits of this chieftain restored comparative peace on the Cāḷukyan border and gave the kākatīya family some respite.

Eṟṟa's wife Kāmasāni is said to have made Bēta the *Kākativallabha* and preserved the house of Kākati [125]. This statement indicates how serious the situation was for the Kākatīya family after the death of Guṇḍyana. Probably, the family would have been extinguished but for the timely help of Eṟṟa. Bēta's son, Prōla I, was also known as *Kākativallabha* [126] and the mention of Bēta too as such may be taken to signify the commencement of his independent rule with the support of his kinsmen of the Viryāla family.

The Gūḍūr inscription also mentions a Pallavarāya and a Bhāskara in connection with Bēta's becoming the *Kākativallabha*. Though this part of the record is not quite clear, it appears as though Bhāskara had some connection with this event. A chieftain of this name figures as the brother-in-law of the Cāḷukyan king Ammarāja II. He deserted the king during the period of his troubles and joined hands with his rival, Bādapa. After his successful usurpation of the Cāḷukyan throne, Bādapa showed great deference to his ally Bhāskara and gave him a valuable gift [127]. This Bhāskara may be identified with the Bhāskara of the Gūḍūr inscription. It may be supposed that he was exercising some kind of control over the eastern border of the Vēngī kingdom on which Koṟavi, Gūḍūr and a number of other places were situated. This explains the mention of Bhāskara in connection with Bēta's institution over Koṟavi and his being described as the *Kākativallabha*. Perhaps Kāmasāni obtained his permission as the overlord for the installation of Bēta.

---

124. *Tel. Ins.* Kak. No. 55. Verse 5.

125. "*Kakati nilputa*" occurring in this connection means either the preservation or the institution of the house of Kākati. I prefer the former meaning because it accords with the general trend of the inscription.

126. See the Pālampēṭ inscription in *Hyd. Arch. Ser.* No. 3. Verse 11.

127. *Ep. Ind.* XIX. p. 137.

The only other event of Bēta I's reign was his fight with the Cōḷas. One of the Kāzipēt inscriptions [128] mentions that he "obtained great wealth by churning the ocean that was the army of the Cōḷa king". It is impossible that this petty ruler of a small territory in the Dakkan could have entered the Cōḷa country and fought with its ruler. But contemporary history of the Vēngī country indicates, however, that it was possible for Bēta to come into conflict with the Cōḷa forces, even without invading the Cōḷa country. Mention has already been made of the passage of a Cōḷa army through Vēngī in 999 A. D. S'aktivarman, the successor of Bādapa on the Vēngī throne, fought with the Cōḷas while he was a youth [129]. This was one occasion on which Bēta could have fought with the Cōḷas, by helping S'aktivarman. The Cōḷas entered the Āndhra country for a second time in 1008 A. D. [130]. The Western Cāḷukyas of Kalyāṇi became very powerful by this time and there were frequent fights between them and the Cōḷas. On this occasion the Cōḷa forces invaded the Western Cāḷukyan territory and penetrated as far as Kollipāka. There they inflicted a crushing defeat on the Caḷukyas. Of these two Cōḷa invasions, the second was more alarming for Bēta because Kollipāka, upto which the Cōḷas penetrated, was very near his own principality. By the time of the earlier invasion Bēta was probably still in troubles and did not, as yet, receive the help of the Viryāla family. It may be held, therefore, that he fought with the Cōḷas in 1008 A. D. It is not known if he took part in the fight as a subordinate of the Western Cāḷukyas. In the absence of any statement to that effect in the Kāzipēt inscription it may be supposed that he was fighting the Cōḷas on his own account and as a measure of self-defence. Since he is said to have amassed wealth by fighting with the Cōḷas, it is likely that he attacked the Cōḷa army while it was returning from its victory at Kollipāka and plundered its baggage and equipment.

VII. PRŌLA. I. 1030—1075 A. D.

Prōla I succeeded to the Kākatīya kingdom after the death of his father Bēta I. Those were critical times and required a man of great valour and statesmanship to protect

128. *Kak. Sam.* App. Ins. No. 1.
129. See Note 5 above.
130. Nilakanta Sastri - *The Colas* I. p. 236.

this small principality from numerous dangers that threatened it from all sides. The political condition of the Dakkan at the time was rather frightening. The Cōḷas of South India and the Western Cāḷukyas of Kalyāṇi were engaged in a deadly struggle for supremacy and carried on protracted warfare [131]. Towards the close of the 10th century A. D., a fresh complication was introduced in this conflict on account of the establishment of Cōḷa influence over Vēngī [132]. The pride of the Western Cāḷukyas was pricked when their Cōḷa adversary stole a march over them. Consequently they also began to expand their dominion towards the east so as to reach the coast and attack the Cōḷa in his new stronghold. The ambitions of these princes were furthered by the civil wars, usurpations and internal dissentions in Vēngī itself [133]. With his principality situated on the border between the Western Cāḷukyan and Vēngī kingdoms, Prōla I was exposed to dangers on either side. In addition to this, the Nāgavaṁs'is of Cakrakūṭa (Bastar) in the north-east were also on the war path [134]. Prōla I had an eventful reign. One of the Kāzipēt inscriptions [135]

---

131. Dr. S. K. Ayyangar—*Ancient India*. pp. 40-53.

132. This began with the marriage of Vimalāditya, the Eastern Cāḷukyan king with the daughter of Rāja Rāja Cōḷa, the great. Vimalāditya's son Rāja Rāja was also married to a Cōḷa princess.

133. It is generally supposed that the reign of Rāja Rāja, the Eastern Cāḷukyan king, was entirely peaceful and that he was succeeded in the Āndhra country by his half-brother Vijayāditya. But a number of C. P. grants recently discovered give a different version. The Pāmulavāka C. P. of Vijayāditya VII. (J. A. H. R. S. II. Pts. 3 and 4 p. p. 277-289) state that Rāja Rāja ruled for 12 years and was then defeated and dethroned by his brother Vijayāditya. Obviously, there was fighting between the two brothers during 1030-1034 A. D. The Telugu Academy Plates of S'aktivaraman II (*Ibid* V-i. p. p. 33-49) mention that after Rāja Rāja ruled for 41 years, Vijayāditya conquered his kingdom, instituted his own son, S'aktivarman II over it, that the latter died after a brief rule of one year and that therefore Vijayāditya resumed his rule over the Vēngī kingdom. Thus it is evident that on account of dissentions between Rāja Rāja and Vijayāditya, the Vēngī Cāḷukyan Kingdom was in disorder between 1022-1065 A. D.

134. This was the time when under Dhārāvarṣa the Cakrakūṭa kingdom was making rapid progress. His influence extended eastwards as far as the Vizag District, for, his feudatory, Candrāditya, is known to have made a grant of land with his permission in the Vaḍḍavādi Nāḍu. (M. E, R. 1909 Pt. II. p. 116).

135. *Kak. Sam.* App. Ins. No. 1.

describes his exploits in detail and credits him with the conquest of the Cakrakūṭa-Viṣaya and Bhadrangapura and the subjugation of some minor chieftains. He is also said to have obtained the Anamakoṇḍa-Viṣaya from Trailōkyamalla. Prōla's general, Bamma, fought with the Cōḷas at Kāncī and secured a glorious victory for his overlord[136].

The Kāzipēt inscription, referred to above, seems to be a mere chronicle of Prōla's achievements and the course of events mentioned therein has to be determined entirely in the light of contemporary history. It is said that Prōla slew in battle the son of a certain Kodvarti Dugga and obtained the Purakūdēśa. Another rival that was likewise killed by him was a certain Gonna. He then obtained the Anamakoṇḍa-Viṣaya, which obviously contained the principalities of all these chieftains, as a fief from Trailōkyamalla. Evidently, the Anamakoṇḍa district was included by this time in the empire of Sōmēśvara I. The Kāzipēt inscription does not state why Prōla fought with the chieftains of that district or why it was conferred upon him. It is likely that they some how incurred the displeasure of the Western Cāḷukyan monarch and that Prōla I was asked to subdue them and was granted the district as a gift in recognition of his services. Thus Prōla seems to have become a vassal of Sōmēśvara. Probably, e w as constrained to accept this position on account of the rapid expansion of the Western Cāḷukyan dominion towards the east coast and on account of the existence of his own principality in the way of this expansion[137].

The next exploit of Prōla was his fight with the ruler of the town of Bhadranga as a sequal to which the latter was put to flight. This rival of Prōla may be identified with Pommaṇa, the ancestor of the Rānjana family of Kākatiya subordinates and the great-grand-father of Gadādhara, a feudatory of Rudradēva. The title *Bhadrangapuravarādhīśvara* held by the members of this family[138] indicates that the town called Bhadranga was their headquarters and supports this identification.

136. See. *Hyd. Arch. Ser.* No. 3 the Pālampēṭ inscription and *Tel. Ins.* Kak. No. 9. from Pillalamaṟṟi wherein this event is described.

137. The chaotic condition of the Vēngi country and the probability of its proving a source of danger to the Kākatiya kingdom might have also influenced this decision of Prōla.

138. The existence of this feudatory family is revealed by the Bekkallu inscription published by me as Ins. No. 12. of the *Kak. Sam* App.

Another event of Prōla's reign was the attack of his general Bamma against Kāncī. An inscription from Pillalamaṛṛi[139] in the Nalgoṇḍa District mentions that this Kākatīya subordinate "uprooted the tree of honour of the Cōḍa king in the fearful sport of war taking away the door of the gateway of the city of Kāncī". The Pālampēt inscription[140] of the famous Kākatīya general, Rēcerla Rudra, states that "after the blowing of the bugles, he (Bamma) pushed aside in a moment, as if it were a curtain, the door of Kāncī and performed for the Kākativallabha, the marriage with the goddess of victory". None of the two records referred to above, mention under what circumstances general Bamma invaded Kāncī on behalf of his overlord Prōla I. One event of contemporary history, however, enables us to determine the circumstances under which this exploit of Bamma might have been performed. The Cōḷas invaded the Western Cāḷukyan dominion in 1052 A. D. and were opposed by the Cāḷukyan forces at Koppam. In the battle that ensued, the Cōḷas were defeated and Rājādhirāja was killed. The Cāḷukyas pursued the retreating enemy up to Kāncī and sacked the city.[141] Prōla I and his general Bamma seem to have played a prominent part in this campaign and Bamma might have forced an entry into the city by defeating the Cōḷa forces that were defending it.

Prōla marched next against Cakrakūṭa in the north. The circumstances under which this expedition was undertaken by him are not mentioned in the Kāzipēt inscription but may be inferred from other sources. Cakrakūṭa was at this time under Jagadēkabhūṣaṇa Dhārāvarṣa, the powerful Nāgavaṁśi ruler[142]. In 1061 A. D. he attacked the northern border of the Vēngī Cāḷukyan kingdom. His territory already extended along the northern bank of the Gōdāvary and into the Vizāgapaṭam District on the east coast. This was a great menace to the safety of the Kākatīya kingdom which was situated in the Warangal District on the southern bank of the river. This might have been one

139. *Tel. Ins.* Kak. No. 9.

140. *Hyd. Arch Ser.* No. 3.

141. Sewell - H. I. S. I. p. 75.

142. MER. Nos. 231, 231 & 234 of 1909 show that this ruler flourished during 1060-1070 A. D.

cause of Prōla's expedition against Cakrakūṭa. The Eastern Cāḷukyan king Rāja Rāja and his son Rājēndra are known to have besiezed Cakrakūṭa between 1061-1063 A. D.[143] in retaliation of Dhārāvarṣa's attack against the northern border of their own kingdom. Five years later, the Cōḷa king Vīrarājēndra invaded Cakrakūṭa and was opposed by the Cāḷukyan forces[144]. It is not known whether Prōla's invasion had any connection with either of these two invasions. It is probable that he was commissioned by his Cāḷukyan overlord Sōmēśvara to oppose the Cōḷa who invaded Cakrakūṭa. Prōla found in this scope for the fulfilment of his own ambition of crippling the power of Dhārāvarṣa. It may, therefore, be supposed that after the return of the Cōḷa forces, Prōla attacked Cakrakūṭa and inflicted a defeat on its ruler Dhārāvarṣa, who was already tired out by his fight with the Vēngī Cāḷukyas.

Prōla took great pains to promote the material welfare of his subjects. The Mōṭupalli pillar inscription of the time of Gaṇapatidēva[145] credits him with the construction of a big tank called[8] Jagatkēsarin which was like "a representative of the ocean and the collection of all the waters that were originally created".

Prōla passed away after an eventful reign of 36 years, bequeathing the kingdom to his son Bēta II.

VIII. BĒTA. II. 1075—1110 A. D.

Bēta II ruled over the Kākatīya kingdom till 1110 A. D. His reign was uneventful excepting for the acquisition of another neighbouring district. It was a period of consolidation and settlement. The political condition of contemporary Dakkan and South India accounts for the uneventful nature of Bēta's reign. There was no cause for anxiety from the north because Dhārāvarṣa of Cakrakūṭa passed away and his successors were busy with their own

---

143. J. A. H. R. S. V-i. p. 37.

144. MER, No. 182 of 1915.

145. *Ep. Ind.* XII. p. 188. But curiously the Ēkāmranātha Inscription (Vide *Ind. Ant.* XI, p. 7) credits Prōla I's grand-son Prōla II with this achievement. It is perhaps a mistake.

problems [146]. In the east, the Vēngī kingdom was enjoying comparative peace under Vijayāditya VII and on his death was incorporated into the Cāḷukya-Cōḷa empire of Kulōttunga I. Its government was thereafter entrusted to the care of the latter's sons who were sent over here as viceroys. On account of the lukewarm interest shown by these viceroys in the affairs of the Vēngī kingdom, the Velnāḍu Chiefs of Candavōlu became the *de jacto* rulers and were rapidly consolidating their position [147].

Almost all the inscriptions of Bēta, discovered so far, mention him as a feudatory and subordinate of Vikramāditya VI [148]. In some he is described as having the title *Vikramacakri.* Bēta's subordination to Vikramāditya is further borne out by the title "Tribhuvanamalla" which sometimes accompaines his name [149], and at others stands for it [150]. The Canarese inscription at Anamakoṇḍa belonging to the time of Bēta's son, Prōla II, states that Bēta's minister, Vaijadaṇḍādhinātha made his master bow at the feet of *Caḷukya-*

146. The Rājapur C. P. mentions a Madhurāntakadēva, who HiraLal surmises, is identical with Dhārāvarṣa himself. But the Madras Epigraphist believes that Madhurātntaka might have been a usurper or a rebellious cousin with whom Sōmēsvara I, son of Dhārāvarṣa, fought and killed before succeeding to the throne himself. The earliest known date of Sōmēs'vara is S, S. 992 or 1070 A. D. as given by M. E. R, No. 354 of 1909. It is thus evident tha Dhārāvarṣa passed away certainly by 1070 if not earlier. As No. 256 of the same year's collection indicates, Sōmēs'vara was busy fighting his cousin Madhurāntaka before his accession and the Cāḷukya-Cōḷa viceroys afterwards. On account of these troubles he hardly found time to turn his attention towards the Kākatīya kingdom.

147. See my *History of the Velnāḍu Chiefs* in J. A. H. R. S. V-2.

148. Cf. *Kak Sam.* App. Ins. Nos. 1, 2 and 4.

149. See line 20 of the Anamakoṇḍa inscription of the time of Rudradēva (*I. A. XPI.* p. 257), Kundavaram inscription of Kundāmbikā (*Kak. Sam.* App. Ins. No. 14), the Mādireḍḍikuṇṭa inscription of the time of Prōla II (*Ibid.* No. 39) and the Mōṭupalli pillar inscription of the time of Gaṇapatidēva (*Ep. Ind.* XII. p. 188) wherein Bēta II is simply referred to as *Tribhuvanamalla.* The Ēkāmranātha inscription of the time of Gaṇapatidēva (*I. A.* XXI. p. 200) and the Canarese inscription of Anamakoṇḍa of Prōla II's time (*Ep. Ind.* IX. p. 256) on the other hand refer to him by his name.

150. *Kak. Sam.* App. Ins. No. 4.

Cakri and made him rule over Sabbi 1000 [151]. It looks as though Bēta somehow offended Vikramāditya and was about to be punished by that monarch but sought his mercy and was forgiven, mainly through the intervention of his minister. Probably, he tried to throw off the Western Cāḷukyan yoke and harassed the Sabbi district of their empire during the reign of Sōmēs'vara II, taking advantage of the dissentions between him and his powerful brother Vikramāditya. It is rather strange that under these circumstances, Bēta should not only be forgiven for his treachery but also be granted the Sabbi 1000 district by Vikramāditya. Two reasons may be assigned for this. Firstly, this region might have been purged of its troublesome elements on account of Bēta's aggressions into it in which case it amounts to an indirect good service rendered by him to the Cāḷukyan state. Secondly, Vikramāditya might have realised that the Kākatīya principality would be a buffer state between his own dominion and the Vēngī country and that it might facilitate his expansion to the east coast. It is also likely that this gift was made to Bēta in order to ensure his loyalty.

Bēta's position became secure after he made peace with the Cāḷukyan emperor. He styled himself a *Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara* and used the five musical instruments and other insignia of royalty [152]. He also assumed the title *Calamartigaṇḍa* [153] which thereafter became hereditary in the Kākatīya family. He was also known as *Paraśu* [154] which means '*axe*' and probably indicates his dexterity in using the battle-axe. One inscription from Kāzipēt describes him as the "Lion to the errotic elephants who were the Cōlas

151. *Ep. Ind.* IX. p. 256 Verse 3.

152. *Kak. Sam.* App. Ins. Nos. 2, 4 and 5.

153. *Ibid* No. 5 Inscriptions and literature indicate how this title became hereditary. The Mādireḍḍikuṇṭa inscription (*Ibid* No. 39) shows that Bēta II's son, Prōla II, had it. This title is included in a long list of *Birudas* given to Gaṇapatidēva in an inscription discovered at Warangal. (*Ibid.* No. 26). The *Pratāparudrīya* of Vidyānātha ascribes this title to Rudrāmbā and her grandson Pratāparudradēva. (See the *Kāvyaprakaraṇa* verses. 10 and 14).

154. *Kak. Sam.* App. Ins. No. 1 lines 18—19.

and the Māḷavas " [155]. It is not known why and when he came into conflict with the Māḷavas. This is probably a mere boast. Nor is it known on which occasion he had to fight with the Cōḷas. This too must either be a boast or Bēta must have helped his overlord Vikramāditya VI in his wars with the Cōḷas.

The reign of Bēta II was peaceful and this was not a little due to the administrative skill of his minister, Vaija-daṇḍādhinatha who was the hereditory *Mahāmātya* and who is said to have borne the entire burden of the Kākatīya kingdom. He was highly accomplished in the arts and widely known for his charities. Bēta had plenty of time to devote to many activities. He was an ardent devotee of S'iva and had the title *Paramamāhēs'vara* [156]. A fragmentary inscription from Kāzipēt [157] mentions that he was a disciple of Rāmēs'varadīkṣita, a great S'aivite divine of the time, who was also the preceptor of Prōla II. Bēta planted a beautiful garden and excavated a tank called S'ivapura at Anamakoṇḍa [158]. He also made valuable gifts to the temple of Prōḷēs'vara, evidently built in the name of his father, Prōla I.

One incident of note which took place during the reign of Bēta was the location of his capital at Anamakoṇḍa from which he derived the title *Anamakoṇḍa puravarādhis̀vara* [159].

155. *Ibid* lines 11—20.

156. *Kak. Sam.* App. Ins. No. 2 line 14.

157. *Ibid.* p. 255. This inscription is engraved on the same pillar which contains Ins. No. 1.

158. *Ibid.* No. 1.

159. *Ibid.* No. 2. lines 12 and 13. This title continued to be borne by the descendants of Bēta II even when the town ceased to be their capital. Its adoption by Rudradēva and Gaṇapatidēva, who also ruled from Warangal for some time and by Rudrāmbā and Pratāparudradēva who ruled from Warangal alone, indicates that this title subsequently became hereditary in the Kākatīya family.

IX. PRŌLA II. 1110-1581 A. D.

The reign of Prōla II[160] constitutes an important landmark in the history of the Kākatīyas. The general condition of the Dakkan at the time of Prōla's accession was remarkable. The Viceroys of Kullōttunga on the east coast were more concerned with the affairs at the imperial capital in South India rather than with the administration of the Vēngi country and so real power passed into the hands of the Velnāḍu chieftains of Candavōlu. As a result of this, the other co-feudatories and minor powers became assertive[161]. In the interior the Western Cāḷukyan empire was divided into a number of feudatory principalities whose rulers were frequently at war with each other. It was in this peculiar atmosphere that Prōla conceived schemes of aggrandisement leading to the foundation of an independent kingdom.

Prōla II was a great fighter. His exploits are described at length in the Anamakoṇḍa inscription of the time of his son Rudradēva[162] and the Gaṇapavaram inscription of Gaṇapāmbā[163]. He is said to have defeated Tailapadēva, Gōvindarāja, Gunḍa and Jagaddēva. There is considerable difference of opinion regarding the indentity of these rivals of Prōla and the location of their respective territories[164].

---

160. It is believed that the Canarese inscription of Anamakoṇḍa is the only record of Prōla (vide remarks of Krishna Sastry in *Ep. Ind.* XII, P. 260) but six more records of this monarch have been discovered in recent years. Five of them have been included in the *Telingana Inscriptions* as Kak. Nos. 1, 3, 4, 51 and 54.

161. For further details see my paper entitled "*History of the Velnāḍu Chiefs*" in J. A. H. R. S. V-2 pp. 65-72.

162. *Ind. Ant.* XXI. p. 157.

163. *Ep. Ind.* III. p. 83.

164. My views regarding the identity of Prōla's rivals differ from those of the previous writers and are based on a number of inscriptions discovered in the Nizam's Dominions. These views have been discussed by me in my "*Political History of the Kakatiyas*" in J. A. H. R. S. Vol. V. pp. 238. No evidence has so far come to light that would contradict them. Regarding the views of other scholars see Krishna Sastry in *Ep. Ind.* XII. pp. 160-161; Fleet in *Ind. Ant.* XI. pp. 10-11, K. V. S. Iyer - *Historical sketches of Ancient Dakkan* pp. 177-178 and Hultzsch in *Ep. Ind.* III. p. 88.

The clue is to be found partly in the Anamakoṇḍa inscription itself and partly in the inscriptions recently discovered in the Telingana part of the Nizam's Dominions [165]. The Anamakoṇḍa inscription, mentioned above, narrates not only the exploits of Prōla II but also those of his son Rudradēva. It also enumerates at the end the boundaries of the dominions of the latter. These are said to be the Mālyavanta mountain in the north, the sea in the east, Śrīśailam in the south and Kaṭaka (Kalyāṇi) in the west. The extention of the Kākatīya kingdom up to these limits was the result of the combined conquests of Prōla and Rudradēva. The Kākatīya kingdom consisted of Koṛavi, the Anamakoṇḍa-viṣaya and the Sabbi 1000 district at the time of Prōla's accession. These three divisions correspond more or less to the modern Warangal District in extent. A comparison of the extent of this territory with that of Rudradēva as stated in the Anamakoṇḍa inscription shows that the kingdom expanded on all sides and that the difference in its extent as at the time of Prōla's accession and as at the time of the conclusion of his son's conquests is remarkable. This difference in extent indicates the zone within which Prōla and Rudradēva conducted their operations. This zone obviously stretches to the north, west and south of the principality that Prōla II inherited at the time of his accession. It is reasonable, therefore, to suppose that the rival chieftains who are said to have been vanquished by Prōla and Rudradēva were rulers of small principalities within this zone.

The first chieftain with whom Prōla came into conflict was Tailapadēva, "the head-jewel of the Cāḷukyas, who was skilled in riding the elephants". The Kākatīya king is said to have captured this rival but released him out of devotion and affection [166]. Who was this Tailapadēva and why did Prōla release him? Rice assigned the Anamakoṇḍa inscription to the 9th century A. D. and believed that the Taila above was Taila I of the Western Cāḷukyan dynasty [167]. Both the date and the identification of this scholar are untenable, because, the inscription itself bears the date S. S. 1084 corresponding to 1162 A. D. Fleet, who edited

165. See *Tel. Ins.* published in 1935.

166. Verse 8 of the Anamakṇḍa inscription in Ind. Ant. XXI.

167. *Ind. Ant.* XXI. p. 10.

the Anamakoṇḍa record, has identified this Taila with Taila III of the same dynasty. Hultzsch has supported this identification [168]. Mr. Krishna Sastry, who edited the Canarese inscription of Anamakoṇḍa, belonging to the time of Prōla II, commented on this identification saying "this identification implies a pretty long reign for Prōla from at least 1170 A. D, the date of the present record, to 1151 A. D., the first year of Taila III, unless we suppose that Prōla fought with Taila while the latter was still a prince [169]. There are many objections to Fleet's identification. In the first place, it is against the spirit of the Anamakoṇḍa inscription itself. There is nothing in it to show that Taila was an independent ruler at this time. He is simply described as "the head-jewel of the Cāḷukyas". Secondly, Prōla is said to have released Taila out of devotion and affection. If it was for Taila, the Cāḷukyan king, that Prōla had this loyalty and affection he would have avoided coming into conflict with Taila altogether. Further, he could not have shown devotion and affection too towards Taila. They are sentiments which would be appropriate towards people of different status: devotion towards an overlord and affection towards a younger and less illustrious person. Thus, if the Taila above was the Western Cāḷukyan king Taila III, Prōla could have had for him devotion and not affection. Thirdly, there is no evidence to prove that Prōla II was at any time the subordinate of Taila III. It is supposed, on the other hand, that the former aided Bijjala, the Kalachuri chieftain, in bringing about the dethronement of Taila [170]. Fourthly, reliable evidence indicates that Prōla II ruled for some time as an independent chieftain. The Canarese inscription of his time, already referred to, shows that he was a feudatory of Vikramāditya VI. It is not known what his relations were with the latter's successor Sōmēśvara III but there is nothing to show that Prōla was his subordinate. Under these circumstances it will not be reasonable to hold that Prōla was a subordinate of Taila III and that therefore he was devoted to him and released him out of devotion. The only alternative explanation of his devotion and affection is, I believe,

---

168. See *Ep. Ind.* III. p. 88.

169. *Ep. Ind.* XII. p. 160.

170. R. G. Bhandarkar—*Early history of the Dakkan* p. 222.

that postulated by Krishna Sastry. His apprehension regarding the length of Prōla's reign is no longer tenable because it is now proved beyond doubt that it extended between 1110—1158 A. D. It must be taken that the Taila, whom this Kākatīya king is said to have captured and released, was Taila the prince. Several reasons may be adduced in favour of this identification. Prōla's devotion and affection can be properly explained if the two sentiments are taken to refer to two individuals. It has been stated already that Prōla was for some time a feudatory of Vikramāditya VI. His devotion may be for this monarch who was his overlord. Taila was a member of the Cāḷukyan royal family and probably of the same age as or a little younger than Prōla himself. Thus Prōla could have affection for this young prince. The validity of this supposition is proved further by a number of inscriptions discovered in the neighbourhood of Prōla's ancestral fief. A record from Nekkoṇḍa in the Mahabūbnagar District[171] registers the gifts made by Lakṣmīdēvī, the queen of Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Tailapadēva. The headquarters of this lady is said to be at Kōḍūr. Another inscription from Panagal in the Nalgoṇḍa District mentions that a certain Bhīma received a gift from Tailapadēva[172]. It is clear from these two records that prince Taila was governing parts of the Mahabūbnagar and Nalgoṇḍa districts in the time of the Cāḷukyan emperor Vikramāditya VI. It is likely that the fight between Prōla II and Tailapdēva took place between 1122 and 1127 A. D. the last year of Vikramāditya.

The next rival of Prōla was Gōvindarāja, whom he captured but released and whose kingdom he gave to Udayarāja[173]. This Gōvindarāja is identical, according to Krishna Sastry, with the Gōvindarāja, the general of Vikramāditya VI, and with Daṇḍanāyaka Gōvindarasa, who was ruling at Koṇḍapalli in 1126 A. D.[174]. Owing to the weakness of Cāḷukya-Cōḷa control over the Āndhra districts and owing to the internal dissentions among the minor powers

171. *Tel. Ins.* Chal. No. 33.

172. *Ep. Ind.* XII. p. 161. Rice took this chieftain to be Gōvinda III the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king. Fleet has remarked that the identity of this Gōvindarāja is not known (Vide. *Ind. Ant.* XXI. p. 10)

173. *Ibid.* No. 37.

174. *Ep. Ind.* XII. p. 261.

of that region, the Western Cāḷukyas made a bold dash into the coastal districts during 1120–1124 A. D. and succeeded in occupying some of the strong holds there. One of them was Koṇḍapalli with whose ruler Gōvinda, Prōla could have fought, probably while attempting to reach the east coast himself.

There is considerable difficulty regarding the identity of the Udayarāja mentioned above. The Anamakoṇḍa inscription refers to a Cōḍōdaya, who is said to have died on account of his fear of Rudradēva, son of Prōla [175]. It is also stated that this Rudradēva burnt the capital of an Udayacōḍa [176], the ruler of Kandūru and married his daughter, Padmā. Cōḍōdaya and Udayacōḍa mentioned above are probably identical. Two other chieftains bearing this name are known to us from literature and inscriptions. There was one Udaya, who was the ruler of Panagal and the contemporary of Mallikārjuna Paṇḍitārādhya [177], the famous Śaivite teacher. An Inscription at Māmiḷlapalli [178], in the Nizam's Dominions, mentions a Gōkarṇa, his son Udayāditya, and his grandsons Bhīma and Gōkarṇa, belonging to a Telugu Cōḍa family. Of these chieftains Bhīma and Gōkarṇa were the contemporaries and rivals of Rudradēva. Their father, Cōḍōdaya, would then be the contemporary and rival of Prōla II and the ruler of Kandūr, in the Mehabūbnagar District. Prōla II might have set up this Telugu Cōḍa chieftain in this region as his subordinate.

The next rival of Prōla was Guṇḍa, 'lord of the city of Mantrakūṭa'. He is said to have evaded Prōla's challenge and fled to his city but was captured, shaved and branded

175. Verse 17.

176. Verses 26–28. The opinion of previous writers has been that this chieftain is identical with a Velnāḍu ruler. Hultzsch identified him with Kulōttunga Cōḷa Gonka III (Vide *Ep. Ind.* XII. p. 83) But the date 1138–1157 A. D. assigned by Krishna Sastry to this chieftain is untenable. The inscriptions of Gonka's father, Cōḍa II, range upto 1181 A. D. while the reign of his son Pṛthvīs'vara seems to have begun by 1186 A. D. (Vide my "*History of the Velnāḍu chiefs*" in J. A. H. R. S. V–2 p. 65–72) I believe that the Cōḍōdaya, mentioned above. is not a ruler of the Velnāḍu family but the ruler of Panagal.

177. *Paṇḍitāradhyacaritramu—Mahimāprakaraṇamu*, pp. 292–301.

178. *Kak. San.* App. Ins. No. 17.

with the boar seal ([179].) Krishna Sastry identified Mantrakūṭa wiih the village of Manthani in the Nuzvid Zamindari of the Krishna District ([180].) But this identification seems to be untenable. Firstly, there is no evidence to prove that the Kākatīya kingdom extended into the Krishna District in the time of Prōla II. Secondly, there is no evidence either at Manthani or in its neighbourhood indicating any connection with the name of Guṇḍa. It would be more reasonable, to identify Guṇḍa's capital, Mantrakūṭa, with Manthena, a village situated on the Gōdāvari in the Karimnagar District of the Nizam's Dominions· This place is popularly known as Mantrakūṭa. Further an inscription engraved on a stone lying on the bund of a tank in this village, [181] belongs to the time of Kākatīya Gaṇapatidēva and opens with salutations to "god Gōpījanavallabha of Mantrakūṭa". The grant portion also contains numerous references to several acts of piety like the construction of tanks, hamlets and temples at Mantrakūṭa. This record proves that this Manthena must be the old Mantrakūṭa. Guṇḍa must have been its ruler in the time of Prōla II. The Pālampēṭ inscription of Rēcerla Rudra [182] a general of Gaṇapatidēva, mentions that Kāma Camūpati, the commander of Prōla's forces, killed Guṇḍa, ruler of Manthena. The Gaṇapēśvaram inscription too, refers to the death of Manthanya Guṇḍa in the time of Prōla. Taking all these facts into consideration' it may be concluded that in the first encounter with Prōla, Guṇḍa was captured and humiliated and that while he was flying to his own capital Prōla's general Kāma brought him to bay and killed him in the encounter that followed.

Jagaddēva was the next and strongest of Prōla's enemies. It is said that this chieftain, accompanied by many other Cāḷukyan co-feudatories, besieged Anamakoṇḍa but was stunned on account of Prōla's valour and [183]. Fleet identified this Jagaddēva with a Sāntara chief of Poṭṭupuṁbuccapura and a feudatory of Vikramāditya VI and Jagadēkamalla [184]. According to Krishna Sastry, "he must have

179. The Anamakoṇḍa Ins. Verse 10.
180. *Ep. Ind. XII.* 261. Dr. Fleet remarked that the identity of this place is not known (*Ind. Ant.* XXI. P. 10).
181. K. A.—Sastry *The Thousand Pillar Temple Ins.* (Telugu) p. 89 where this Ins. has been mentioned.
182. *Hyd. Arch. Ser.* No. 3. p. 27.
183. The Anamakoṇḍa Inscription. Verse 11.
184. *Ind. Ant.* XXI. p. 10.

stood encompassing the city of Anamakoṇḍa on behalf of the Cāḷukyan emperor in order to avenge himself upon Prōla, who, it may be supposed, was trying to throw off his allegiance to the Cāḷukyas " [185]. There are several objections to Fleet's identification of Jagaddēva. In the first place, it is not likely that the distant ruler of Poṭṭupumbuccapura could have come to Anamakoṇḍa unobstructed. There were, further, other powerful feudatories in the neighbourhood of Prōla's principality whom the Cāḷukyan king could have sent against Prōla. Secondly, there are many inscriptions in the Nizam's Dominions round about Anamakoṇḍa which definitely refer to the rule of a Jagaddēva and of Kākati Prōla after him. No such evidence is available in the case of Jagaddēva of Poṭṭupumbuccapura. There is a record at Lēmulavāḍa, in the Karimnagar District, which mentions a Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Jagaddēva of the Polavākakula in S. S. 1031 corresponding to 1109 A. D. [186]. At Nagunūr in the same district is another record which mentions a Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Dommerāja and Jagaddēva and says that these two chieftains fought with 80,000 forces [187]. A third inscription from Gaṇapavaram in the Nalgoṇḍa District mentions [188] a certain Hēmadri bhūpati who made Jagaddēva his minister and commander-in-chief. It is said that after Jagaddēva, Prōla, the Kākatīya king, ruled the earth. All these three inscriptions seem to refer to the same person. The Gaṇapēśvaram record shows that this was the rival of Prōla mentioned in the Anamakoṇḍa inscription. It is also possible to determine approximately the date of Jagaddēva's siege of Anamakoṇḍa. It is likely, as Krishna Sastry has surmised, that this chieftain besieged the Kākatīya capital in order to punish Prōla II for his insubordination to the Western Cāḷukyas. Since Prōla is known to have been a feudatory of Vikramāditya VI for some time, and since he figures later as an independent ruler, it may be supposed that be proclaimed his independence immediately after the death of that Cāḷukyan monarch in 1127 A. D. Jagaddēva's invasion may therefore be assigned to about 1130 A. D. and it may be supposed that

185. *Ep. Ind.* XII. p. 161.

186. *Kak. Sam.* App. Ins. No. 9.

187. *Ibid.* No. 10

188. *Ibid.* No. 11.

be undertook it on behalf of his overlord Jagadēkamalla II .[189] He was however, defeated by Prōla and put to flight.

Prōla was not satisfied with his aggressions in the north, south and west. He turned his attention towards the east also. The Krishna and Guntūr Districts were at this time under the Velnāḍu ruler Gonka II (1131-1163 A. D.) the most powerful member of his family [190]. Gonka's son and successor, Cōḍa II, is described in an inscription dated 1169 A. D. as the burner of Kākati Prōla [191]. Prōla died in 1158 A. D. and that year falls within the regnal period of Gonka II. The circumstances that brought about this tragedy can easily be imagined. The Kākatīya kingdom which was confined to the Warangal District at the time of Prōla's accession, was extended, as the result of his exploits, into the Karimnagar, Nalgoṇḍa and Mahabūbnagar Districts. To the east of this territory lay the districts of Krishna and Guntūr which were included in the kingdom of Gonka II. The Kalachuris were powerful at Kalyāṇi, to the west of the Kākatīya kingdom. Prōla seems to have made an attempt to penetrate into the dominion of Gonka in order to reach the east coast but was opposed by Gonka's son Cōḍa and killed in an encounter.

A few officials and subordinates of Prōla II are known from the inscriptions of his time. Kāma Camūpati, of the Rēcerla family, was the commander-in-chief of his armies. An inscription from Māṭēru in the Warangal District [192] mentions a certain Mallenāyaka, the *Mahāsāmanta* of Prōla II. Another record from Karīmnagar [193] states that a brahmin minister called Gangādhara was a trusted official of this king and that he looked after all the affairs in the royal palace. The Canarese inscription at Anamakoṇḍa mentions that Bēta, son of Vaijadanḍādhinātha, the famous minister of Bēta II, was another minister of Prōla. He was a great scholar, an adept in many arts and a man of extraordinary intelligence and upright conduct.

189. See remarks of Krishna Sastry in *Ep. Ind.* XII. p. 261.
190. See my *"History of Velnāḍu chiefs"* in J. A. H. R. S. V-2. pp. 68-72.
191. S. I. I. IV. No. 1482.
192. *Tel. Ins.* Kak. No. 4.
193. *Ibid.* No. 6.

X. RUDRADĒVA 1158—1196 A. D.

Rudradēva ascended the Kākatīya throne after the death of his father Prōla II in 1168 A. D. He was a great fighter. He came into conflict with numerous Cāḷukyan feudatories around his principality, vanquished many of them and expanded his dominion in a remarkable manner. This career of vigorous aggrandisement brought him also into direct conflict with the rulers of Velnāḍu in the east and the Yādavas on the west.

Rudradēva is described in numerous records as a great fighter. Besides his own famous inscription in the Rudrēśvara temple at Anamakoṇḍa [194], the records of his successors refer in glowing terms to his numerous deeds of valour. He is discribed in most records as the burner of numerous cities belonging to rival kings. The Bekkallu inscription of his Rānjana subordinates states that "the cities of his enemies were destroyed on accout of his valour, as if by the fatal fire generated by the glance of Śiva". The Kundavaram grant [195] of his niece, Kundāmbikā, mentions that he was "the night of darkness to the host of Kṣatriyas and that having destroyed a hundred cities he outdid even the god Rudra who is famous as the destroyer of three cities only". The Upparapalle inscription of the time of his nephew, Gaṇapatidēva, [196] describes him as "sporting always with th goddess of victory". The Malkāpuram inscription [197] of Rudrāmbā's time mentions that "out of all the kings, we hear of Rudradēva only as the hero, because with him alone the goddess of victory was stable and sportied, as if with balls, with the heads rival kings severed by his sword".

The main events of the reign of Rudradēva are mentioned in his Anamakoṇḍa inscription. This record enumerates the chieftains that were vanquished by him. It is

194. *Kak. Sam.* App. Ins. No. 11.

195. *Ibid.* No. 14.

196. *Hyd. Arch.* Ser. No. 8.

197. *Kak. Sam.* App. Ins. No. 31.

also stated therein that in 1162. A. D., the date of that record, the dominion of Rudradēva stretched up to S'rīs'ailam in the south and the sea on the east. There is no mention in it, however, of any ruler of the east coast of the Āndra country or the S'rīs'ailam region with whom Rudradēva fought in order that he could have expanded his territory in these two directions. Nor was it possible for Rudradēva's father Prōla II to annex these regions, for, he was fighting for the most part with co-feudatories alround his own principality in ihe interior. It may be concluded therefore that the extention of Rudradēva's kingdom upto S'rīs'ailam in the south and the sea in the east was the result of other expeditions, not mentioned in the Anamakoṇḍa inscription.

Gonka II of the Velnāḍu family was ruling on the east coast with his dominion extending up to Mahēndragiri in the north and S'rīs'ailam in the south-west [198]. His son, Cōḍa, killed Rudradēva's father, Prōla II, probably when Prōla attempted a raid into the Velnāḍu kingdom. The desire for avenging his father's death must have inspired Rudradēva to lead an attack against Gonka II. This attack seems to have consisted of two campaigns, one lead by Rudradēva himself against S'rīs'ailam and Tripurāntakam [199] and the other lead by his general, Inangala Brahmi Reḍḍi, against Drākshārāma and the Gōdāvary region [200]. As indicated in the Anamakoṇḍa inscription, both these campaigns were successful.

The other exploits of Rudradēva are mentioned in the Anamakoṇḍa record [201]. He is said to have defeated Domma, Mēḍa, Mailagidēva and Bhīma and destroyed the capital of Cōḍōdaya. The opinions of previous writers regarding the identification of these chieftains become untenable, as I have shown elsewhere [202] on account of the discovery of new inscriptions in recent years.

198. *Ep. Ind.* I. p. 32.

199. MER No. 45 of 1919–30.

200. S. I. I. IV. No. 117.

201. Verses 14–28.

202. J. A. H. R. S. VI–i pp. 25–28.

The first rival of Rudradēva was a certain Domma, a great rider, whom the Kākatīya king is said to have "broken as if in sport, wounded with numerous arrows, as Pārtha did Karṇa, put to flight and acquired his principality with all its towns, villages and other possessions"[203]. Fleet remarked "Domma is not identifiable but as Dōma, Domba or Dāma is the name of a mixed caste he may have been the leader of some aboriginal tribe"[204]. This surmise is now unnecessary. Domma and Jagaddēva are mentioned in a short inscription from Naganūr[205] as having fought with an army of eighty thousand, though it is not known against whom they fought. The exact location of the principality of Domma too is not known. There is a village named Doṁmagūḍem in the agency part of the East Gōdāvary District situated on the bank of the Gōdāvary. Possibly, this village is named after a chieftain called Domma who may be identical with the Domma of the Naganūr and Anamakoṇḍa records. Since Guṇḍa, the ruler of Manthena on the southern bank of the Gōdāvary, was a rival of Prōla II, it is reasonable to suppose that the principality of Domma lay between Manthena in the north and Bhadrāchalam in the south along the southern bank of the Gōdāvary in the north-eastern portion of the Warangal District. By conquering this chieftain, Rudradēva succeeded in extending his dominion from Manthena to the Eastern Ghats along the bank of the Gōdāvary.

The next rival of Rudradēva was Mēḍa. An inscription from Gōvindāpuram[206] in the Pākhāl taluk, situated more or less in the middle of the Warangal District, mentions the minister of a certain Mēḍa and registers his gifts to a Jaina temple. Probably this Mēḍa was the rival of Rudradēva and ruled over some territory in the Pākhāl taluk extending up to the Gōdāvary, in a south-eastern direction.

Mailagidēva was another rival of Rudradēva. The latter is said to have "taken away the valour of Mailagidēva in battle and obtained the wealth of the Polavāsadēśa"[207].

203. See the Anamakoṇḍa inscription, Verse 14.
204. *Ind. Ant,* XXI. pp. 9–20.
205. *Kak. Sam.* App. Ins. No. 10.
206. K. A. Sastry—*The Thousand Pillar temple Ins.* p. 36.
207. See verse 15 of the Anamakoṇḍa inscription.

There is difference of opinion regarding the identity of this Mailagidēva. Hultzsch held that "this may have been the Yādava king Mallugi who, according to the Paiṭhān grant, was the predecessor of Bhillama (S. S 1109—1113)[208]. This identification is objectionable for several reasons. Firstly, the Yādavas and the Kākatīyas were still distant enough from each other at this time and did not become neighbouring powers in order that they could have come into conflict with each other. Secondly, the Anamakonda inscription itself would have mentioned the family of Mailagidēva, as it does in the case of Tailapadēva, had he belonged to an independent ruling family. Mailagi must therefore have been one of the numerous Cāḷukyan feudatories that governed a small principality in the neighbourhood of Anamakoṇḍa. The Anamakoṇḍa record itself supports this view when it states that Mailagi was connected with Polavāsadēśa. This Polavāsa may be identified with the village of Polāsa, in the Jagatyāl taluk of the Karīmanagar District and its neighbourhood. The village contains a number of ruined buildings and antiquities including traces of the mud wall of a fort and seems to have been a place of considerable importance at one time. This Polāsa might have been the headquarters of a small fief called Polavāsadēśa ruled over by Mailagidēva. The defeat of this Mailagidēva resulted in the annexation by Rudradēva of the Polāsa taluk of the Karīmnagar District which lies to the south-west of the Manthena region.

The next campaign of Rudradēva seems to have been directed against Bhīma and Cōḍōdaya, the Telugu Cōḍa chieftains in the Mahabūbnagar District. Bhīma was the most powerful of these and the Anamakoṇḍa inscription describes vividly how this ruler increased his power and influence with marvelous rapidity and how Rudradēva crushed him effectively[181]. Bhīma was so inhuman as to kill his own brother, Gōkarṇa, unawares while the latter was at his meals, "just as a strong kitten pounces upon a house-rat or a mangoose strikes the death-blow against a snake". He added a new feather to his cap by usurping the throne of king Tailapa who died out of abject fear of

208. Dr. Fleet has stated that this chieftain cannot be identified (Vide *Ind. Ant.* XXI. p. 11.)

209. See Verses 17 and 26—28.

Rudradēva [210]. Having heard of these misdeeds of Bhīma through his spies, Rudradēva became enraged, made up his mind to destroy this upstart, summoned his armies and started on a grand victorious campaign. "Having gone three or four paces, he burnt, as the first gulp or a clean harvest" Cōḍōdaya's city of Vardhamāna. "Startled by the sight of Rudradēva's eye, Bhima abandoned all shame along with all his riches and ran away to the forest with his brothers, mother and wives". Cōḍōdaya's life repaired to heaven as if in madness or forgetfulness on account of the whole of his body being smitten by the arrow of fear, which was the valour of Rudradēva[211]". After burning the city of Vardhamāna, Rudradēva pursued Bhīma and on the way broke into the city of Cōḍōdaya, burnt it down and created a beautiful tank in its midst[212]. The Kākatīya monarch is described as "the only support of Padmā who was born from the womb of the milk-ocean that was the family of Udayacōḍa of Kandūr.[213] The identity of Bhīma, Gōkarṇa and Cōḍōdaya can be established with the help of the Māmiḷḷapalli inscription[214] referred to previously. According to it Bhīma was the son of Vijayāditya and the grandson of a Gōkarṇa. This Vijayāditya may be identified with the Cōḍōdaya of the Anamakoṇḍa inscription. He seems to have been governing a small fief from Vardhamāna and Kandūru with the aid of his two sons Gōkarṇa and Bhīma. As stated previously, Prōla II instituted this Telugu Cōḍa family as his feudatories over territories in the Mahabūbnagar District which he had conquered from Gōvindarāja. It is likely that these feudatories threw off the Kākatīya yoke immediately after the death of Prōla II in 1158 A. D. and proclaimed their independence. Rudradēva's invasion was therefore intended to punish these rebels. After the successful termination of this campaign, the Kākatīya monarch seems to have married Padmā, probably a daughter of Cōḍōdaya. Rudradēva instituted the Gōna family as the feudatory rulers at Vardhamānapura.

---

210. These two seem to be mere boasts.
211. Verse 17.
212. *Ibid.* Verse 17.
213. *Ibid.* Verse 18.
214. *Kak. Sam.* App. Ins. 7.

The Anamakoṇḍa inscription mentions Kalyāṇi (Kaṭaka) as the western boundary of Rudradēva's kingdom. It is likely that after subjugating the rivals mentioned above and consolidating his annexations Rudradēva made a bid for Kalyāṇi taking advantage of the weakness of the Kalacuris and held it for a time.

The campaigns of Rudradēva described in the Anamakoṇḍa inscription were concluded by 1162 A. D. They enhanced his power and prestige and made him one of the important rulers of the Dakkan. Rudradēva's reign was peaceful for the next quarter of a century. He devoted this well earned rest to constructive activity. Being an ardent devotee of Śiva and a great lover of art, he constructed a majestic temple in the city of Anamakoṇḍa and instituted in it god Rudrēśvara. This was done immediately after the termination of his military campaigns and was probably intended as a token of his gratitude to his favourite deity. It was also probably during this period that the monarch received the famous Śaivite divine Pālkuriki Sōmanātha at his capital [215]. Besides being a great fighter, Rudradēva was also a reknowned scholar and is said to have composed a work called *Nītisāra* in the Sanskrit language [216]. Another event of note that may be assigned to this period was the adoption of Warangal as an additional capital. The Kākatīya monarchs from the time of Bēta II were ruling from Anamakoṇḍa and had the title *Anamakoṇḍa-puravarādhīśvara*. Probably, Rudradēva found this town too small a capital for the now expanded kingdom. He therefore improved the old town of Warangal considerably, made it his collateral capital and transacted part of his business from that town [217].

The east coast attracted the attention of Rudradēva once again in 1186 A. D. The Velnāḍu chief, Gonka II, seems to have reconquered the Drākshārāma region probably while the Kākatīya monarch was busy with his military campaigns. Gonka was followed by his son Cōḍa II who was an incapable ruler. Several feudatories and neighbouring rulers harassed him continually [218]. A serious local feud known as the Palnāḍu war broke out in 1176 A. D. and ended with disastrous

215. See chapter XXI.
216. J. A. H. R. S. VI-i. p. 29.
217. *Kak. Sam.* App. *Śivayōgasāramu*--Intro. Verse. 20.
218. J. A. H. R. S. V-2. pp. 71-72.

consequences. Cōḍa died in 1181 A. D. even while the war was in progress and was succeeded by his son Gonka III. Curiously enough, no records of Gonka III are available and we know very little about him. He was evidently dead by 1186 A. D. in which year his son Pṛthvīs'vara, figures as the independent ruler. This Pṛthvīs'vara, however, ruled in the region to the north of the Gōdāvary with Piṭhāpuram as his capital [219] and he did not exercise any authority over Velnāḍu, his ancestral dominion. Obviously, this territory was lost to him and he was therefore obliged to retire beyond the Gōdāvary. The presence of Rudradēva at Drākshārāma in 1186 A. D., [220] the year of Gonka III's death and Pṛthvīs'vara's accession, is very suggestive. I believe that taking advantage of the decline of the power of the Velnāḍu chiefs and the advent of a new ruler, Rudradēva invaded the east coast, defeated and killed Gonka III in an encounter and drove his son Pṛthvīs'vara beyond the Gōdāvary. It must be in connection with this victory that he visited Drākshārāma and offerred gifts to god Bhīmēs'vara.

Rudradēva returned to his capital after his victorious campaign on the east coast and continued to rule in peace. One problem, however, worried him viz., the future succession to the Kākatīya throne. He is known to have had a number of younger brothers, including Mahādēva, who succeeded him on the throne and not any sons [221]. The Upparapalle inscription [222] and the traditional works, however, mention Gaṇapatidēva as the son of Rudradēva while the bulk of literary and epigraphical evidence describes him as the son of Rudradēva's younger brother Mahādēva. It is likely that being childless, Rudradēva treated his nephew Gaṇapatidēva as his own son. The traditional works [223] contain a funny story about the relations that existed between Rudradēva and Mahādēva. They state that becoming jealous of the power of his brother, Mahādēva intrigued with the officials and feudatories of the realm for his own elevation to the throne. These subordinates are said to

219. *Ep. Ind.* IV. p. 35.

220. S. I. I. IV, No. 1107.

221. *Ind. Ant.* XXI. pp. 197 & 202; also note 44 on p. 202.

222. *Hyd. Arch. Ser.* No. 3.

223. *Pratapacaritramu.* p. 29-30,

have promised Mahādēva to make him the *Yuvarāja* when Rudradēva's son Gaṇapatidēva would become the ruler. Not content with this, Mahādēva is said to have renewed his treacherous activity. Disgusted with this, Rudradēva is stated to have punished Mahādēva drastically. This story seems to be a very unsuccessful way of explaining the presence at one and the same time of Rudradēva as the reigning monarach, Gaṇapatidēva as his adopted son and heir and Mahādēva as the *Yuvarāja*, on the one hand and of the succession on the other hand, of Mahādēva and not Gaṇapatidēva to the throne after the death of Rudradēva. Mahādēva's succession instead of that of his son may be explained in a way. Gaṇapatidēva is known to have been alive till 1262 A. D.[224] and the traditional works mention that he died in his eightieth year. This places his birth in or about 1182 A. D. He would be hardly 14 years old at the time of Rudradēva's death in 1196 A. D. and unfit to ascend the throne. It must be for this reason that his father Mahādēva ascended the throne instead of him.

While Rudradēva was thus busy with domestic affairs war clouds were gathering strong on the northern horizon and a serious danger was brewing up. The Yādavas of Dēvagiri, who, like the Kākatīyas, assumed independence after the fall of Taila III, had by now consolidated their position and begun a vigorous policy of expansion to the south. Jaitrapāla, the Yādava king, who ruled between 1192-1206 A. D. was, like Rudradēva, a great fighter and speedily expanded his kingdom. The Yādava and Kākatīya kingdoms thus became neighbouring states whose destinies at the time were in the hands of strong chieftains. The kingdom of Rudradēva extended up to the Mālyavanta hill in the north and then along the course of the Gōdāvary upto the boundary between the districts of Karimnagar and Nānded and then to Kalyāṇi and from there along the southern border of the Mahabūbnagar District upto Srīsailam. It effectively blockaded Yādava expansion to the east and into the heart of the Dakkan. There was also the danger of a probable vanguard attack by the Kākatīyas in case the Yādavas penetrated due south to the west of Kalyāṇi. Thus Jaitrapāla was put to the necessity of fighting the Kākatīyas. The preoccupations of Rudradēva must have

224. MER. No. 28 of 1930-31.

inspired Jaitrapāla to invade the Kākatīya dominion. Rudradēva opposed this intruder. It is said that Jaitrapāla "assumed the sacrificial vow on the holy ground of the battle field and throwing a great many kings into the fire of his prowess by means of the laddles of his weapons, performed a human sacrifice by immolating a victim in the shape of the fierce Rudra, the Lord of Tailingas and vanquished the three worlds[225]. Thus Rudradēva met his death in this fight with Jaitrapāla.

XI. MAHĀDĒVA 1195-1198 A. D.

Mahādēva succeeded to the Kākatīya kingdom after the tragic death of his elder brother Rudradēva. His reign is shrouded in great mystery and was perhaps uneventful except towords the end. No grant made by him or by any of his feudatories or officials has been discovered so far. We have therefore to rely upon the incidental references in the records of subsequent rulers to reconstruct his reign.

Though the reign of this king started under very bad auspices on account of the sudden death of Rudradēva there were no adverse effects of a serious nature. One reason that accounts for the preservation of the kingdom was the great valour and strength of Mahādēva himself. There are numerous references to his personal gifts in the records of subsequent years. The Pākhāla inscription of the time of Gaṇapatidēva mentions " Mahādēva, the brother of Rudradēva, whose armies sported on the shores of the ocean and who bore the earth on his shoulder and held aloft his own umbrella[226].. According to the Ēkāmranātha inscription of the same reign "Mahādēva was like the Pārijāta tree to the ocean of the Solar family. On account of his more b.illiant fame that of the other kings was like an ordinary lamp set up during day time"[227]. The Kundavaram inscription states[228] that "after the death of Rudradēva, his younger brother, Mahādēva, bore the earth successfully". In the famous Malakāpuram inscription it is said that "on account of the gale of valour of Mahā-

225. Verse 41, of the *Rajapras'asti* of Hēmādri's *Vratakhaṇḍa.*
226. *Hyd. Arch. Ser.* No. 4.
227. *Ind. Ant.* XXI. p. 200.
228. *Kak. Sam.* App. Ins. NO. 14.

dēva the lamps of valour of the other kings became put out". Mahādēva's valour is highly praised in the Garavapāḍu plates also [229].

Mahādēva married Bayyalamahādēvī and begot Gaṇapatidēva and Kundāmbikā. Kundāmbikā was married to Rudra of the Natavāḍi family. This was an act of great statesmanship. Natavāḍi lay as a wedge between the Kākatīya kingdom and the east coast and this matrimonial alliance gave the Kākatīyas a free passage into Velnāḍu. Thus Mahādēva paved the way for the conquests of his great son Gaṇapatidēva.

The traditional accounts ascribe two other events to the reign of this monarch. One of them is the setting up of an inscription in the S'ambhu temple [230]. This inscription may be the one engraved on a stone now lying mutilated in front of the Svayambhu temple in the fort of Warangal [231]. It mentions a certain Upamanyumuni and a Dhruvēśvaramunīs'vara who is said to be a master of Śaivasiddhānta. The relation between Mahadēva and these two divines is not quite clear but it may be presumed that the purpose of this inscription was to record gifts made by Mahādēva to either or both of them.

The other incident of the reign preserved in tradition is Mahādēva's fight with the Yādavas of Dēvagiri. This king is said to have besieged Dēvagiri for three months [232] and died in an unequal elephant combat with the enemy. This version is supported by the Garavapāḍu plates [233] which mention that "Mahādēva ruled the entire circle of the earth up to the Cakravāḷa Mountain, the residential rampart of the Sēuṇa king, which, breached by the tusks of whose elephants, eclipses the Krauñca mountain cleft by S'arvaṇabhava ". Probably, he undertook this expedition in order to avenge the death of his brother Rudradēva at the hands of Jaitrapāla. This is corroborated by the records of the Yādavas also.

229. *Ep. Ind.* XVIII. pp. 346-356.
230. Toe *Pratāvacaritramu* p. 30.
231. Tel. Ins. Kak. No. 52.
232. Ibid. See also the *Sōmadēvarājīyamu*, asvasa 2.
233 Ep. Ind. XVIII. No. 41, Verse 41.

The Paiṭhan grant of Yādava Rāmachandardadēva [234] contains two important facts viz., that Jaitrapāla slew in battle a king of Trikaḷinga and occupied his territory and that he, "the ocean of compassion, fetched Gaṇapati out of prison and made him lord of the earth". Who was this king of Trikaḷinga? and who was the Gaṇapati that was liberated by Jaitrapāla? Ancient Sanskrit literature and the writings of foreign travellers like Pliny mention that there were three regions on the east coast known by the name of Kaḷinga. The Eastern Gāngas and the rulers of Cēdi had the title *Trikaḷingādhipati* [235]. But there is no evidence to prove that either of these families came in to conflict with the Yādavas. The Gāngas and the Cēdi rulers called themselves Lords of the three Kaḷingas, though they ruled only over parts of Kaḷinga. The Kākatīya king Mahādēva also could be called *Trikaḷingādhipati* because he too ruled over the Drāksharāma region in southern Kaḷinga which his brother Rudradēva conquered in 1158 A. D. The Trikaḷinga king mentioned in the Paiṭhan grant may therefore be taken to be Mahādēva, the Kākatiya king. This invasion ended in the death of Mahādēva [236] and the capture of his son and heir apparent Gaṇapatidēva.

XII. GAṆAPATIDĒVA 1198-1262 A. D.

The reign of Gaṇapatidēva, the greatest of the Kākatīyas started under very bad auspices. He accompanied his father Mahādēva in the invasion against Dēvagiri in 1198 A. D., as stated previously, and was captured and imprisoned by Jaitrapāla. There is abundant evidedce to show that Gaṇapatidēva did not ascend the Kākatīya throne immediately after the death of his father but was away from the kingdom for some time. An inscription from Bahal [237] in the Mysore State mentions that Jaitrapāla "the ocean of compassion, made Gaṇapati, the lord of the Āndhra Country". The Pālampēṭ inscription [238] of Rēcheral Rudra, a subordinate,

234. *Ind. Ant.* XIV. p. 314.

235. R. Subbarao-*History of Kaḷinga* p. 112.

236. See the Yenamandala inscription of Gaṇapāmbā in *Ep. Ind.* III. p. 101.

237. Sewell-H. I. S. I. p. 128.

238. *Hyd. Arch. Ser.* No. 3. Verses 21-24.

of Gaṇapatidēva, mentions that "soon after the death of Rudradēva, a number of enemies invaded the Kākatīya kingdom with the object of snatching it away. Rudra opposed these enemies. He cut off the head of one of them and stuck it on a spear. Seeing this, these intruders like king Nāgati, fled for their lives. Thus when the goddess of the Kākatīya kingdom stepped on thorns, Rudra lifted her up, removed the thorns and re-established her in security". This inscription is dated 1213 A. D. and indicates that these events took place early in the reign of Gaṇapatidēva. Another inscription from Pillalamarri[239] dated 1202 A.D. states that in that year Gaṇapatidēva was ruling the kingdom in which all risings and troubles were put down. It is more or less certain that the troubles referred to in this record were the same as those described in the Pālampēṭ inscription. These must have beset the Kākatīya kingdom after the death of Mahādēva in 1198 A. D. and before 1202 A. D. The absence of any reference to Gaṇapatidēva in the Pālampēṭ record, in connection with the repelling of the invaders, is remarkable and may be taken to indicate his absence. Further, no inscriptions of this ruler are available between 1198 A. D., from which year his rule seems to have been counted and 1202 A. D., the date of the Pillalamarri inscription, mentioned above. It is certain therefore that soon after his father Mahādēva was killed before the walls of Dēvagiri, Gaṇapatidēva was captured and imprisoned by the Yādavas. When this news spread, several feudatories might have decided to make a bid for liberty and risen in revolt. The loyal general, Rēcherla Rudra, stood by the Kākatīyas and put down all these rebellious feudatories, restored order in the kingdom and looked after it till the return of Gaṇapatidēva. It is for this great service that he is called *Kākatirājya-bhāra-dhaurēya* or "the bearer of the burden of the Kākatīya kingdom". Since the Pillalamarri inscription is dated 9 March 1202 it may be supposed that Gaṇapatidēva was liberated early in that year.

The traditional works mention that Gaṇapatidēva died at the ripe old age of eighty and his reign itself is known to have extended over 62 years[240]. He must have ascended the throne while yet a youth. It is likely that he had witnessed

239. *Tel. Ins.* Kak. No. 9. p. 29 Ins. 34-35.

240. S. I. I. IV. No. 1341.

the brilliant conquests and administration of his illustrious uncle Rudradēva and made up his mind to out do him. The political condition of the time was very favourable for his designs. The Yādavas were extending their influence to the south alongside of the western border of the Kākatīya kingdom. On the east coast, the kingdom of the Eastern Gāngas, which touched the Drākshārāma region, was passing through evil days. Rāja Rāja III (1198-1211) A. D. its ruler, was a weakling and the Muhammadans continually harassed the northern border of his kingdom. In the time of the next ruler Ananga Bīma III (1211-1238 A. D. also there was continued trouble for the Gāngas from the Muhammadans and the ruler of Tummāna [241]. Further down, in the region between the Gōdāvary and the Krishna, the Kolani Chiefs of Ellore were powerful under Kēs'avanāyaka. Part of the Krishna District was under the sway of the Cāgi chiefs of Guḍimeṭṭa. In the Guntur District proper, many minor chieftains were ruling e. g. The Kōṭa chiefs of Dharaṇi-kōṭa, the Koṇḍapaḍamaṭis of the Narasaraopet Taluk, the Telugu Cōḍas of Koṇidena, and the rulers of the Ayya family at the mouths of the Krishna. West of Bezwada, stretching upto Madhira in the Nizam's Dominions, was the principality of Natavāḍi which was under a seperate line of chiefs, who, as has already been stated, became the relatives of the Kākatīyas. The southern portion of the Guntur District, comprising the Ongole taluk, was under the Sēuṇa rulers of Addanki. Further south, the Telugu Cōḍas of Nellore, who formally acknowledged the suzereinty of the Cōḷas of South India, were becoming powerful. All these minor powers were struggling for existence and expansion and this afforded an excellent opportunity for the rise of a strong imperial power.

Gaṇapatidēva made the best use of this situation, used both tact and valour, subjugated the entire Āndhra country and established the imperialism of the Kākatīyas. The Pākhāla inscription [242] states that the servants of Gaṇapatidēva "present in several assemblies the rulers of Kāsī, Kaḷinga, Kērala, Tummāna, Kuru, Arimarda, Magadha, Nēpāla, and Cōḷa, and the Śaka and Hūṇa kings respectively as those that were vanquished by their overlord". The Ēakāmranātha

241. Jour. As. Soc. Beng. LXXII No. 2 pp. 116-120.
242. *Hyd. Arch Ser.* No. 4.

inscription [243] of Sāmantabhoja, one of the famous Kākatīya generals, mentions that "the heart of the Sēuṇa trembled and the ruler of Kaḷinga was shamed by the force of the armies" of Gaṇapatidēva. The kings of Lāṭa and Gauḍa are said to have lived as his servants. The Upparapalle inscription of Rēcarla Rudra [244] contains valuable information about Gaṇapatidēva's conquest of Kalinga. His victories in the Velnāḍu and Vēngī regions are mentioned by numerous inscriptions and the Śivayōgasāramu [245]. The other exploits of Gaṇapatidēva were the restoration of Manmasiddi of the Nellore branch of the Telugu Cōḍas [246] and his subjugation of Gangaya Sāhiṇi, an influential chieftain of the Ceded Districts. The crowning act of this monarch's glory was the conquest of Kānchī and his victory over the Yādavas of Dēvagiri.

Gaṇapatidēva seems to have turned his attention first towards Velnāḍu, for, some of his earliest inscritions are found in this region. As stated previously, the exploits of Rudradēva were confined to the north of the Gōdāvary on the east coast and he could not extend his dominion into the Krishna and Guntur Districts. The reign of his successor, Mahādēva, was too short and brought to an abrupt end. The presence, under these circumstances, of some of the earliest inscriptions of Gaṇapatidēva in the northern and eastern portions of the Guntur District proves beyond doubt, that Velnāḍu was the first among his conquests. Two records of this monarch dated 1209 A. D. are found in the Bāpaṭla and Palnāḍu taluks [247]. An inscription from Ippaṭam [248] in the Guṇṭūr taluk dated 1211 A. D. indicates that the Kōṭa Chiefs became the subordinates of Gaṇapatidēva by that year. A fourth record [249] dated 1214 A. D. is found at Duggirāla in the Tenāli taluk. It may be concluded from this evidence that Gaṇapatidēva's conquest of Velnāḍu took place during 1209-1214 A. D. Several reasons might have influenced Gaṇapatidēva's decision to make Velnāḍu the venue of his first campaign. In the first

243. *Ind. Ant.* P. 200
244. *Hyd. Arch. Ser.* No. 3.
245. *Kak. Sam.* APP. P. 12 Verses 25-27.
246. MER. NO. 769 of 1922.
247. MER. 803. of 1922 and 93 of 1929.
248. MER. 717 of 1920
249. MER. 717 of 1920

place, the Guntur District lay as a wedge between S'rīśailam and the trans-Gōdāvary region which were Kākatīya posssessions and its conquests therefore was a necessity. Secondly, it contained numerous petty states engaged in mutual warfare and this made the conquest of this region easy either by diplomacy or by the sword. Thirdly, the fertile tracts of the Krishna delta, the rich mines of Palnāḍu, the valuable diamond beds and the extensive sea board with harbours of international fame, like Mōṭupalli and Kothapaṭnam, of the Velnāḍu country, must have been a great attraction for Gaṇapatidēva. The last but most important of all the reasons was the proximity of this region to Natavāḍi where his relations held sway and which afforded a convenient passage to the east coast. Velnāḍu seems to have fallen an easy prey to Gaṇapatidēva. There is no reference in any of the sources to any battle fought in this connection. Probably, this region was undefended after the fall of the Velnāḍu rulers in 1186 A. D. With the subjugation of the Kōṭa chiefs in 1211 A. D. the whole of Velnāḍu lay at the feet of Gaṇapatidēva. An inscription from Chēbrōlu [250] states that the monarch carried to his city handsome women, fine men, elephants and horses and precious stones which he seized throughout the country of Velnāḍu".

Gaṇapatidēva's attention seems to have been required in the south-eastern part of his kingdom almost at the same time. His rule was recognised at Tripurāntakam as early as 1209 A. D. in which year his sister Mēlāmbikā made gifts to the local temple [251]. This region was conquered by Rudradēva in 1158 A. D. from the Velnāḍu rulers. Bordering on this province were the territories of the Telugu Cōḍas in the Nellore and Cuddapah Districts. These chieftains nominally recognised the overlordship of the Cōlas of South India. Taking advantage of the weakness of Kulōttunga III, these Telugu Cōḍas occupied Kāncī in 1212 A. D. [252]. According to an inscription from Pudukōṭah [253], the Cōḷa king sent an army to the north and recaptured Kāncī. A subordinate

250. *Ep. Ind.* III. pp. 82-93.

251. MER. 204 of 1905.

252. Nilakanta Sastry– *The Cōḷas* II – Pt. i. p. 134.

253. *Ibid.*

of Ganapatidēva is described in an inscription of 1213 A. D.[254] with the title *Kāñcī-cūra-Kāra* or plunderer of Kāñcī. The Pudukōṭah inscription also refers to Kulōttunga's subjugation of the Vaḍugār and the Vēngīmaṇḍalam. Another record from Pudukōṭah,[255] dated 1207 A. D., also contains a similar mention. There is, on the other hand, no evidence to prove that any Cōḷa iinvasion reached the northern districts of the Āndhra country after Gaṇapatidēva's occupation of Velnāḍu. If there is an element of truth in these Cōḷa inscriptions, they may be taken to mean that the Cōḷa king despatched his forces against the Kākatīya possessions in the Kurnul District as a measure of retaliation for Gaṇapatidēva's occupation of Velnāḍu which was formerly a Cāḷukya-Cōḷa possession. It was probably in order to prevent the recurrence of this trouble from the Cōḷas that Gaṇapatidēva made an alliance with the Telugu Cōḍas of Nellore, induced them to occupy Kāñcī so as to divert the attention of the Cōḷa and sent one of his own subordinates to help them in this enterprise.

There is reason to believe that the first compaign of the reign of Gaṇapatidēva was conducted in 1212 A. D. against Kaḷinga. The Upparapalli inscription of Rājenāyaka[256], a subordinate of the famous general Rēcerla Rudra, dated 1235 A. D., mentions a number of exploits of Rājenāyaka. It is said that he killed a number of heroes at Bokkera, cut off the head of a certain Gōdhūmarāti, conquered Udagiri, put to flight a certain Paḍirāya and set up perpetual lamps before god Bhīmēśvara at Drākshārama. There is an inscription at Drākshārama[257] itself bearing the date S. 1134 or 1212 A. D. which registers Rājenāyaka's gift of perpetual lamps. Obviously the Upparapalle inscription was referring to this gift made 23 years earlier. It also follows that Rajenāyaka's exploits mentioned in that record preceded the setting up of perpetual lamps at Drakshārama and were performed in or about 1212 A. D. These exploits were obviously the result of an expedition conducted by Rājenāyaka into Kaḷinga. Of the two places mentioned above

---

254. MER. 47 of 1929 - 30
255. *The Colas* II. pt. 1. pp. 132 - 133.
256. *Hyd. Arch. Ser.* No. 3. lines 57-61.
257. S. I. I. IV. No. 1117.

Bokkera may be identified with the village of that name in the Āska taluk of the Ganjām district. Udagiri also might have existed in the neighbourhood. Gōdhūmarāti and Paḍirāya were probably two of the local chieftains whom the Kākatīya general vanquished. The Śivayōgasāramu mentions [258] a number of victories achieved by Sōmaya, one of the members of the Indlūri family, in the country beyond the Krishna. Sōmaya must have partook in this Kaḷinga campaign and lead a second expedition. It is said that he left Warangal at the head of a large army and marched in the eastern direction and annexed the principalities of a number of chieftains. He then captured the divisions called Kāḍi and Gōgulanāḍu and the famous fortress of Kolani which was then in the hands of a powerful local family. The general then crossed the Gōdāvary and marching further north conquered the two Māḍias and the twelve agency states in the East Gōdāvary district. This brought him into the territory of the ruler of Kaḷinga wherein he performed some more exploits and annexed new territories. Thus this first campaign of Gaṇapatidēva's generals into Kaḷinga was a great success. Ananga Bhīma III (1211-1238) the contemporary ruler of Kaḷinga, was at war during this period with the Muhammadans and the Ṭummāna ruler of Cēdi and this facilitated the penetration of the Kākatīya generals into the Gānga Kingdom.

While his generals were winning laurels at Bokkera and other fields, Gaṇapatidēva busied himself carrying on peaceful negotiations for the expansion of his territory into the Krishna District, especially the coastal region in the neighbourhood of the mouth of the Krishna. This region was held in those days by a line of powerful chieftains who belonged to the Ayya family [259]. Bhīma, the founder of this family, was a man of great influence and ruled over Kroyyūru in the Velnāḍu country. His sons Jilla, Nārāyaṇa and Sūrya were great fighters engaged in serving Cōḍa II, the Velnāḍu ruler of Candavōlu. Nārāyaṇa settled down in Divi, a small island at the mouths of the Krishna and fortified the place. He obtained that island as a fief along with another village called Gonṭu probably from Cōḍa II. This chieftain had four sons, Cōḍi, Bhīma, Pina Cōḍi and

258. Verses 25 - 27.

259. For an account of this family see *Ep. Ind.* III. p. 82 - 93.

Bamma, who were all generals under Cōḍa II. of these four brothers, Pinacōḍi begot two daughters, Nārāmbā and Pērāmbā and three sons Pṛthava, Jaya or Jāyana and Nārāyaṇa. These chieftains must have taken advantage of the confusion that ensued after the fall of the Velnāḍu house and expanded their power considerably in the neighbourhood of the island of Divi. Jaya was a great fighter and wielded considerable influence in the Krishna District at this time. Gaṇapatidēva took stock of the situation and found that Jaya held the key to mastery of the district and that he was a possible source of danger to the Kākatīya dominion in the Krishna District. Accordingly, he made up his mind to win over Jaya and thus clear the path. Here also, the monarch followed the line of least resistence and used the same diplomacy which he tried with success in Velnāḍu. Gaṇapatidēva espoused Nārāmbā and Pērāmbā, the two sisters of Jaya, and made him the commander of his elephant forces. Since the monarch is known to have made a gift of the village of Chēbrōlu in the Guntūr District to Jaya as early as 1213 A. D.[260] this matrimonial alliance may be ascribed to that year.

The next event of note in the reign of Gaṇapatidēva was the subjugation of the Telugu Cōḍas of Pottapi and the conquest of Kammanāḍu in the Guntūr District. Oppilisiddhi II, the last known ruler of the Pottapi branch of the Telugu Cōdas, figures in an inscription dated 1224 A. D. at Koṇidena[261] in Kammanāḍu. He is said to have conquered Kammanāḍu by his valour, obtained Gaṇapatidēva's favour and at his command become the governor of Velnāḍu. Gaṇapatidēva is known to have made a grant in the village of Dayyālarāvūru in Kammanāḍu as early as 1218 A. D.[262] The conquest of Kammanāḍu by Oppilisiddhi and his acknowledgement of Kākatīya suzereinty have to be assigned, therefore, to 1218 A. D. Kammanāḍu was formerly governed by the Telugu Cōḍas of Koṇidena. The latest known member of this family is KannaraDēva[263]. Probably Oppilisiddhi killed him

260. *Ep. Ind.* VI. pp. 38-40.

261. S. I. I. VI. No. 628.

262. See Genealogical table on p. 16 of MER for 1900.

263. See Genealogical table on p. 16 of MER. for 1900.

and conquered his territory. It is not known under what circumstances Oppilisiddhi himself became a vassal of Gaṇapatidēva.

There was some trouble on the east coast between 1230 – 35. One of the Drākshārāma inscriptions dated 1233 A. D. describes [264] Jesrāja, a general of the Gānga king Ananga Bhīma III, as "having conquered Vēngibhūmaṇḍala with quickness". Another record [265] of this Gānga general, found in same place, registers his gifts to the local temple in 1230 A. D. Evidently, Jesrāja lead a lightning march into southern Kaḷinga, reconquered the places formerly taken by the Kākatīya generals, Rājenāyaka and Sōmaya and not content with this crossed the Gōdāvary and penetrated into the Vēngi district. This event may be assigned to 1230 A. D. One cause which might have encouraged this Gānga aggression was the pre-occupations of Gaṇapatidēva and his generals at this time. The general Jāya was busy improving his headquarters, Divi [266]. Siddhayadēva, another subordinate, was occupied with work at Mōṭupalli port [267]. Gaṇapatidēva himself was away from his kingdom leading an invasion against the Yādavas. For thess reasons, the Gānga general Jesrāja could penetrate into Vēngī,

Many inscriptions of this monarch refer, as stated already, to his fight with the Yādavas. The latter too claim victories over the Āndhras. Thus, Simhana II, the successor of Yādava Jaitrapāla, calls himself "the uprooter of the water-lily which was the head of the king of Telunga" [268]. In the Paiṭhan grant of Rāmacandra [269], he is said to have overcome an Āndhra king". A third record credits Simhana with the title "the upooter of the water-lily that was the head of the Telunga king and its reinstitutor" [270]. Evidently Kākatiya Gaṇapatidēva and the Yādava king Simhana II fought with each other. The Gaṇapavaram inscription of 1231 A. D. mentions that Gaṇapatidēva was busy at that

264. S. I. I. IV. No. 1252.
265. *Ibid.* 1360.
266. *Ep. Ind.* III. pp. 82–93.
267. MER 606 of 1909
268. Fleet – *Canarese Dynasties.*
269. *Ind. Ant.* XIV. p. 314.
270. *Ep. Carn.* VIII. p. 57.

time fighting with the Sēuṇas and others. Gaṇapatidēva's invasion of Dēvagiri may therefore be assigned to 1230-31 A. D. According to the traditional accounts Gaṇapatidēva inflicted a crushing defeat on the Yādava king and the latter made peace with him and offered him the hand of his daughter Rudradēvi besides a large sum of money as indemnity. It is no longer possible to believe in the matrimonial aspect of this treaty, because it is now beyond doubt that Rudrāmbā was the daughter and not the wife of Gaṇapatidēva. Simhana in his turn claims to have defeated the ruler of the Āndhras, who was obviously Gaṇapatidēva himself, and to have uprooted but reinstated his head. This however, seems to be an empty boast and the fight must have ended in success to the Kākatīyas and the annexation of part of Berar to the Kakatiya kingdom [271].

Soon after his return from the victorious campaign against the Yādavas, Gaṇapatidēva seems to have made arrangements for the reconquest of the Drākshārāma region which was lost to the Gāngas in 1230 A. D. The latest mention of the Gānga general Jesrāja in this region is contained in an inscription of 1233 A. D. Four years later, Vēmādri Reḍḍi, a minister and general of Gaṇapatidēva, was at Drākshārāma making gifts in the local temple [272]. Probably he was dispatched to this region in order to rescue it from the Gāngas and other rivals. Vēmādri Reḍḍi is described in his Drākshārāma inscription as the enemy of a certain Kulōttungarāya-Rājēndra-Cōḍa-Gonka. Evidently, the Reḍḍi's presence at Drākshārāma is in some way connected with his enmity with the chieftain mentioned above and perhaps indicates that his charities in the local temple were in honour of a victory that he obtained over this chieftain. Who was this Kulōttunga-Rāya-rājēndra-Cōḍa-Gonka? Inscriptions in the Kaḷinga country enable us to establish the identity of this chieftain. A record from Śrīkūrmam,

---

271. *Berar Gazetteer* p. 18. No further territorial additions were made by Gaṇapatidēva's successor Rudrāmbā in the north or north-west. By the time of Pratāparudradēva, her successor, the Yādava and Kākatīya dominions touched the northern and southern banks of the Gōdāvary respectively, and there were a number of border fights between the two houses. Obviously, Gaṇapatidēva himself conquered this territory during this war with the Yādavas.

272. S. I. I. IV. No. 1333

whose date corresponds to 1188 A. D.[273], mentions a certain Eṛṛapanāyaka "the foremost among the servants" and a minister also of Pṛthvīs'a *alias* Kullōttunga and registers a gift of his to the local deity. Another record from the same place[274] dated 1206 A. D. mentions Pṛthvīs'a, the ruler of Velnāḍu-viṣaya and his treasurer Ananta, who in that year made a gift to the deity at Śrīkūrmam on the occasion of Mēṣasankrānti. A third record from Piṭhāpuram dated 1210 A. D. registers the gift of Jayāmbikā in the reign of her son Pṛthvīs'vara[275]. Several important inferences may be drawn from these inscriptions. In the first place, the Pṛthvīs'a of the two Śrīkūrmam records is identical and the statement that he was the ruler of Velnāḍu in the second of the records and also in the Pithāpuram inscription, proves further, that this Pṛthvīs'a is identical with the Pṛthvīsvara of the Velnāḍu line who flourished between 1186–1206 A. D. The presence of all the three records mentioned above in the Kaḷinga country to the north of the Gōdāvary, indicates that his territory was situated in this region and that Piṭhāpuram was his capital. This Pṛthvīśvara may be identified with Kulōttungarāya-Rājēndra-Cōḍa-Gonka, the enemy of Vēmādri Reḍḍi, mentioned in the Drākshārāma inscription referred to above. An inscription which records the gifts of a subordinate of Kākatīya Gaṇapatidēva in 1254 A. D. and which refers to this subordinate as "the worster of Kulōttunga-Rājēndracōḍa" of Velnāḍu who,[276] as stated above, may be identified with Pṛthvīs'vara, supports this identification. Probably Pṛthvīśvara took advantage of the Gānga conquest of Vēngī, in 1230 A. D. and tried to follow in their wake in order to reconquer Velnāḍu, the dominion of his ancestors. The absence of Gaṇapatidēva and his generals from the Kākatīya kingdom on account of their invasion of the Yādava capital, might have encouraged him in this direction. Manmasiddhi, son of Cōḷa Tikka, the contemporary Telugu Cōḍa ruler of Nellore, alse seems to have taken an active part in this second campaign of Gaṇapatidēva's time against Kaḷinga. An inscription from Nandalūr[277] dated in the 13th year of Rājēndra Cōḷa

273. *Ibid.* V. NO. 13338
274. *Ibid.* NO. 1254.
275. *Ep. Ind.* IV. PP.: 32–54.
276. MER. No. 160 of 1899.
277. MER. No. 510 of 1907.

mentions that out of his free will Manmasiddhi helped Gaṇapatidēva in a battle on the banks of the Gōdāvary and by his valour made the Kāḷingas face their own country. Since the Kākatīyas are not known to have fought with the Kaḷingas on subsequent occasion and since Manmasiddhi is known to have been figuring in contemporary affairs even from 1243 A. D.[278] his fight with the Kāḷingas, mentioned above, must have been part of the second campaign of the Kākatīyas. In the light of the Drākshārāma and Nandalūr inscriptions, the events of this campaign may be divided into two actions. Vēmādri Reḍḍi and Manmasiddhi seem first to have reached the southern bank of the Gōdāvary. Pṛthvīs'vara summoned the aid of the Gāngas and the allies took their stand on the northern bank of the river. The Kākatīya forces crossed the river and attacked the allies. In the battle that ensued Manmasiddhi fought the Kāḷingas and put them to flight. Vēmādri Reḍḍi attacked Pṛthvīśvara, defeated and probably killed him. This Reḍḍi general then paid a visit to the famous Śaivite temple at Drākshārāma and made offerings to its deity in commemoration of the successful termination of this campaign. This campaign may be ascribed to 1237 A. D. the date of Vēmādri Reḍḍi's Drākshārāma inscription.

There was comparative peace in the Kākatīya kingdom between 1237–1245 A. D. It was probably during this period that the monarch was engaged in constructive work, building numerous temples, improving the irrigation facilities in his kingdom and reorganising the administrative system. Three incidents of the reign which took place during this period deserve special mention. One of them was the marriage of his second daughter Ganapāmbā with the Kōṭa chief, Bēta II. An inscription from Yenamadala[279] states that Gaṇapatidēva's daughter, Ganapāmbā, was married to Kōṭa Bēṭa II and that in 1250 A. D. she instituted at Yanamadala S'iva in honour of her father. It is also mentioned in this record that Bēta II was dead by this time. Gaṇapatidēva himself must have been about 22 years old at the time of his coronation and he begot by his first wife Sōmāmbā, a daughter named Rudrāmbā. Ganapāmbā was obviously the younger daughter of this monarch and

278. *Nel. Dist. Ins.* p. 1258.

279. *Ep. Ind.* III. pp. 94 – 103.

the niece of Jāyasēnāpati. Gaṇapatidēva's marriage with Nārāmbā and Pērāmbā, the sisters of this general, took place, as stated previously, by 1213 A. D. It is likely therefore, that Gaṇapāmbā was about twenty years old by 1235 A. D. Taking all these facts into consideration I ascribe her marriage to Bēta II to a date which immediately followed that of the second Kaḷinga campaign. Another event was the promulgation of an *abhayaśāsana* at the port of Mōṭupalli[280]. The east coast fell into disorder and confusion after the fall of the Velnāḍu rulers. The local rulers in the neigbourhood of this important commercial emporium began to plunder the vessels that called at this port as usual. The merchants therefore gave up visiting this port and it soon fell into disuse. After his conquest of Kammanāḍu, Gaṇapatidēva commissioned his subordinate, Siddhayadēva, to restore the popularity of his port. When this work was finished, the monarch proclaimed the *abhayaśāsana*, guaranteeing security to all the ships that call at the port thereafter, abolished many of the taxes that used to be collected on articles of merchandise and fixed the customs duties levied at the port. The third event that may be ascribed to this period was the active association of Gaṇapatidēva's daughter Rudrāmbā with the administration of the realm. It is known that this Kākatīya queen succeeded her father, ruled the Kākatīya empire till 1296 A. D. and died in that year. According to the traditional works she was eighty years old at the time of her death. She would be about thirty years old by 1235 A. D. She adopted her grandson Pratāparudradēva in or about 1261 A. D. and this prince seems to have been born in 1254 A. D. It is likely that Rudrāmbā became a widow very early in her life. It must be for this reason that Gaṇapatidēva decided to make his daughter his successor. It is likely, therefore, that her association with the government began between 1235-40 A.D. Another incident that may also be assigned to this period was Gaṇapatidēva's subjugation of the Sēuṇa chieftains of Addanki. Mādhava of this family who is described as an independent Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara in 1208 A. D.[281] figures in another record of 1239 A. D. as making a gift for the merit of Gaṇapatidēva. It may be supposed therefore that he was conquered by Gaṇapatidēva about 1239 A. D. This was followed by another important event. A line of Kāyastha chieftains wielded

280. *Ep. Ind.* XII. pp. 188-97.

281. *Nel. Dist. Ins.* D. 76.

great influence in the Cuḍapa and Kurnūl Districts in the 12th, 13th and 14th centuries. Gaṇḍapeṇḍēra Gangaya Sāhiṇi who had grand titles, is the earliest known member of this family. An inscription from Guṇḍlapāḍu [282] in the Palnāḍ taluk of the Guntūr District mentions the chieftain as making gifts to a local deity in 1239 A. D. This Gangaya and his nephews, Tripurāntaka and Ambadēva, figure later as powerful feudatories and governors of parts of the Kākatīya empire. It is likely, therefore, that Gaṇapatidēva subjugated these Kāyasthas in or about 1239 A. D. and thus extended his influence over the greater part of the Ceded Districts.

The political condition of South India about the middle of the thirteenth century necessitated Gaṇapatidēva's interference in the affairs of the local rulers. The Telugu Cōḍas of Nellore were powerful at this time in the Chingelput, Cudapa and Nellore Districts and were nominal feudatories of the Cōḷas. Backed by the Kākatīyas, they held Kāncī and were fighting persistently for its possession. They were at this time under the lead of Cōḷa Tikka who succeeded to power in 1223 A. D [283]. Taking advantage of the weakness of Rājēndracōḷa III, he occupied Kāncī in 1246 A. D [284]. Meanwhile, the Pāṇḍyas too took advantage of the decline of Cōḷa power and launched a campaign of aggression. In the end Sundara Pāṇḍya subjugated the Cōḷa king and thus became supreme in South India. He then turned his attention to the north and invaded the Cōḷa possessions in that region. This naturally brought him into conflict with the Telugu Cōḍas who were governing these possessions. The sequal to this campaign of Sundara Pāṇḍya is described in his records. According to some of these inscriptions [285], the Pāṇḍya killed Gaṇḍagōpāla, defeated Gaṇapati and performed *vīrābhiṣēka* at Nellore. Other records [286] mention that he defeated the Telungas at Mudgūr and occupied Kāncī. The Gaṇḍagōpāla of these records is identical with Cōḷa Tikka while Gaṇapati was the Kākatīya king Gaṇapatidēva. Two

282. MER. No. 69 of 1929–30.

283. Cf. MER. No. 659 of 1904 dated 1225 A. D. which is said to be his third regnal year.

284. *Nel. Dist. Ins.* I. p. 206.

285. MER. 333, 340 and 361 of 1913.

286. MER. 1914 Pt. ii. para 18.

other facts may be noted in this connection. An inscription from Kāḷahasti[287] dated 1248 A. D., indicates the extention of Kākatīya influence into the Chittoor District. Secondly, an inscription of Manmasiddhi from the Nellore District[288] dated 1251 A. D. mentions that year as his third regnal year, indicating thereby that his father Cōḷa Tikka died in 1249 A. D. In the light of all these facts, the course of events may be stated as follows. Alarmed at the rapid growth of Pāṇḍyan power and its extention into the northern part of the Cōḷa dominion, which bordered upon the Kākatīya kingdom, Gaṇapatidēva seems to have despatched an expedition to the south in order to arrest Pāṇḍyan aggression. Cōḷa Tikka jointed this force along with his armies. The allies marched up to Mudgūru in the Punganūr taluk of the Chittoor District where Sundara Pāṇḍya opposed them. In the battle that ensued, the allies were defeated but marched to Kānci. The Pāṇḍya followed them there and defeated them for a second time. The allied forces then ran to Nellore and shut themselves in the city. Sundra Pāṇḍya pursued them and besieged Nellore. In the battle that followed Cōḍa Tikka was killed and the Kākatīya forces retreated into the interior. Then the Pāṇḍya entered Nellore in triumph, performed *vīrābhiṣēka* there and returned to his own territory. Undaunted by these reverses and in order to avenge the death of his friend and ally, Gaṇapatidēva commissioned one of hie valiant generals, Sāmantabhoja to lead a second expedition into South India. This general passed by the provinces of the Telugu Cōdas and entered Kānci unopposed in June 1249 A. D.[289] and stayed there for about a year, holding the city in the name of his overlord Gaṇapatidēva. Manmasiddhi figures as lord of Kāncī in 1253 A. D[290], the year in which Sāmantabhōja was still in the city[291]. Obviously, the Kākatīya general restored Manmasiddhi at Kānci and himself left the city.

The traditional works[292] mention an anecdote regarding Manmasiddhi which again necessitated the interference

287. MER. 201 of 1892.
288. *Ins. Mds. Presy.* II. ND. 639.
289. *Ind. Ant.* XXI. p. 122.
290. Sewell – *H. I. S. I.* p. 148.
291. MER. 2 of 1893.
292. *Sōmadēvarājīyamu.*

of the Kākatīyas in the affairs of the Telugu Cōḍas. It is said that Manmasiddhi was driven out of Nellore by two of his cousins, Akkana and Bayyana. Thereon, Tikkana, the famous Telugu poet whom Manmasiddhi patronised and who was his minister, is said to have gone to Warangal and persuaded Gaṇapatidēva to help his patron out of his troubles. The Kākatīya monarch is said to have finally restored the Telugu Cōḍa to his ancestral seat. An inscription from Nāyanipalli [293] in the Guṇṭūr District states that Gaṇapatidēva burnt Nellore and vanquished Akkana and Bayyana, thus substantially confirming the traditional version. Kopperunjinga, a later Pallava chieftain, invaded Kāñcī and occupied it in 1253 A. D [294] defeating Manmasiddhi. This seems to have been partly responsible for the treachery of Manmasiddhi's cousins. The traditional works state further that after restoring the Telugu Cōḍa, Gaṇapatidēva allowed him 25000 villages and annexed the rest of his dominion to his own empire. In view of the presence of an inscription of the Kākatīya monarch at Nellore in 1255 A. D [295]. and in view of the presence of Kopperunjinga's records at Kāñcī till July and those of Manmasiddhi in September 1254 A. D. [296] the restoration of Manmasiddhi may be ascribed to 1253 A. D.

Two incidents of note took place in 1254 A. D. viz., the birth of Pratāparudradēva and the shifting of the Kākatīya capital permanently to Warangal. Gaṇapatidēva's elder daughter Rudrāmbā was married to Vīrabhadra, a scion of the Cālukyan family of Kolanupāka [297]. There is good reason for believing that Pratāparudradēva was born in 1254 A. D. The strongest evidence in favour of this view is that of the Malkāpuram inscription [298] which is dated 1261 A. D. and which mentions Prataparudradēva as the son of Rudrāmbā. This Kākatīya queen had no male children but only two daughters, the elder of whom, Mummdambā begot Pratāparudradēva. Rudrāmbā adopted this grandson and made him her heir. All these events must have taken place before

293. MER. 769 of 1922.
294. Sewell. H. I. S. I. p. 150.
295. *Nel. Dist. Ins.* I. p. 137.
296. Sewell - *H. I. S. I.* p. 150.
297. *Kak. Sam. App.* Ins. No. 30.
298. *Ibid*, No. 31.

1261 A. D. the date of the Malkāpuram record so that Pratāparudradēva could be described the queen's son in that year. The traditional accounts enable us to determine the date of this prince's birth more accurately [299]. One of them, the Ēkas'ilānagaravṛttāntamu, mentions that Pratāparudradēva was five years old when Rudrāmbā died in S. S. 1216. From this it appears as if the monarch was born in S. S. 1211 or 1289 A. D. The same work states in another place, that the monarch was born on Thursday the fifth day of the bright fortnight of the month of Caitra in the cyclic year Nandana corresponding to S. S. 1166. Another traditional work, the Telugurājulacaritramu, says that the king was born on the same day and month in the cyclic year Ānanda corresponding to S. S. 1160. These dates correspond to 25 March 1254, 22 March 1238, 24th March 1292 and 15th March 1244respectively. Of these the first date may be accepted as correct because Pratāparudradēva would then be about seven years old in 1261 A. D. the date of the Malkāpuram inscription and of an age which renders his adoption by Rudrāmbā proper. I believe therefore that he was born in 1254 A. D. and adopted by his grandmother in 1261 A. D. at the express desire of Gaṇapatidēva.

There was serious trouble in the Kāncī region once again in 1260 A. D. The Pāṇḍyn king is said to have marched to the north. about this time, through the territories of Kopperunjinga and Gaṇḍagōpāla, pursued the Telugu troops up to Nellore and had himself crowned in that city [300]. Kopperunjinga seems to have been in possession of Kāncī at this time [301]. Manmasiddhi figures at Guḍivāḍa in the Krishna District making gifts about this time [302]. That the Pāṇḍya won a victory over the Kākatīyas in 1260 A. D. shows that once again the Pāṇḍyas and Kopperunjinga drove away Manmasiddhi from his dominions, repelled the Kākatīya armies also from the Telugu Cōḍa territory and occupied both Nellore and Kāncī. Gaṇapatidēva was probably too old at this time to be able to take the offensive

299. See my "*Political History of the Kākatīyas*" in J. A. H. R. S. VI-3 & 4 p. 168.

300. MER. 32 of 1891; *Ep. Ind.* VI. p. 307. See also remarks of Sewell in H. I. S. I. p. 154 - 155.

301. MER. 38. of 1890.

302. *Ins. Mds. Presy.* 293.

against these enemies. Further, he was preoccupied at the capital making arrangements for the future welfare of his vast empire. Perhaps he threw the entire burden of the government of the state on his daughter Rudrāmbā and was leading a retired life. Kopperunjinga was in occupation of Kānci in 1261 A. D.[303] but next year he appears at Drākshārāma making gifts in the local temple. He does not, however, seem to have been here as a conqueror. His inscriptions indicate, on the other hand, that it was either as a friend or as a subordinate of the Kākatīyas that he visited Drākshārāma. Two of his inscriptions[304] in the temple register gifts made for the merit of a Kākatīya king while a third one mentions[305] him as "the bee to the lotus feet of Kākati Gaṇapati".

The names of many of the feudatories, generals and officials of Gaṇapatidēva are preserved in inscriptions and literature. The territorial acquisitions made by the monarch increased the number of his feudatories while his numerous wars brought many generals into prominence. The following subordinates deserve special mention:—

FEUDATORIES: *The Rēcerla family*:—Rudra was the most illustrious feudatory of this family. He saved the Kākatīya kingdom from imminent destruction during the absence of Gaṇapatidēva in the Yādava prison and earned the title *Kākati-rājya-bhāra-dhaurēya*. His subordinate Rājenāyaka distinguished himself in the first campaign against Kaḷinga. Nami Reḍḍi, another member of the Rēcerla family, was a great builder. He constructed numerous tanks and temples at Pillalamaṟṟi and Nāgulapāḍu[306]. Kāṭreḍḍi, Kāmi Reḍḍi, Gaṇapi Reḍḍi, Maṟṟeḍḍi, Kāmaya, Nāmaya and Mallaya,[307] other members of this family, also flourished in the reign of Gaṇapatidēva.

The Indulūri family:—Of this brāhmin family of subordinates Sōmaya was the most famous. He was the conqueror of the Kolani chiefs and of a large tract in southern,

303. Sewell – H. I. S. I. p. 155.
304. S. I. I. 1341 and 1342.
305. *Ibid.* 1342 B.
306. *Tel. Ins.* Kak. Nos. 7 and 9.
307. *Ibid.* Nos. 12, 14, 19, 22 and 30.

Kaḷinga in connection with Gaṇapatidēva's first Kaḷinga campaign. His son Manmagaṇnaya also rose to fame in this reign [308].

The Malyāla family:—The most powerful generals of this family, Kaṭacamūpati, Cauṇḍacamūpati and Guṇḍaya flourished in this region [309].

The Ayya family:—Mention has already been made of Gaṇapatidēva's matrimonial alliance with this family and the consequent elevation of Jāya to generalship.

The Telugu Cōḍas:—There were three branches of this family ruling in the Guntūr, Nellore and Ceded Districts. Gaṇapatidēva subjugated all the three branches. Oppilisiddhi of the Pottapi branch became a feudatory and general by 1218 A. D. Kannaradēva of Koṇidena also acknowledged the supremacy of the Kākatīyas. Cōḷa Tikka of Nellore was a friend and ally of Gaṇapatidēva. Tikka's son, Manmasiddhi, continued the friendly relations and seems to have become a feudatory about the middle of the 13th century.

The Telugu Pallavas:—A number of latter Pallava chieftains flourished in the Āndhra country and these also were brought under the Kākatīya yoke. Siddhayadēva [310], one of these chieftains, was the governor of Mōṭupalli. Pallakēta and Pemmayadēva [311] were two more feudatories.

The Kāyastha family:—This was a family of chieftains who wielded considerable power and influence in the Cudapa and Kurnūl districts. Gaṇḍapeṇḍēra Gangayasāhiṇi is the earliest known member of this family. He seems to have been subjugated by Gaṇapatidēva by 1239 A. D. Gangaya's nephew Jannigadēva figures as a prominent general towards the close of the monarch's reign [312].

---

308. *Kak. Sam.* App. p. 13 verse 28; MER. of 19.

309. *Tel. Ins.* Kak. Nos. 7, 8, 17, 20 and 21.

310. MER. 606 of 1909.

311. *Ibid.* 536 of 1909 & MER. 1910 p. 81.

312. *Ibid.* 1935 - 36. para 30.

The Padmanāyakas :—Prasādāditya Nāyaḍu of this family was a contemporary of Gaṇapatidēva. The traditional accounts mention that he rendered valuable services to the monarch and received signal honours [313] from him.

OFFICIALS

Generals :—Several famous generals helped Gaṇapatidēva in his conquests besides members of the feudatory families. Vēmādri Reḍḍi was the leader of the Kākatīya armies that invaded Kaḷinga in 1237 A. D. Sāmantabhōja distinguished himself in the campaign sent against Kaḷinga in 1249 A.D. He belonged to the Dōci family of the Kāśypa *gōtra*. In honour of his triumph at Kānci, this general granted the village of Kaḷattūr to the Ēkāmra temple [314]. Gōvindanāyaka, another general, is said to have conquered many cities [315]. His son Jagadāḷa Mummaḍi, another general, constructed a tank named after himself and a town named after Gaṇapatidēva. He was also the patron of a poet who had the title Kavicakravartin. Bhāskara [316] commanded the elephant forces. Tikka, another commander, granted the village of Garavapāḍu to 50 brāhmins [317]. A certain Boppayadēva figures as the generalissimo of all the forces [318]. Kālapa Nāyaka was another important general [319].

Ministers :—The names of several *Mahāpradhānis* of Gaṇapatidēva's time are known from inscriptions. Mention may be made of Bhāskaradēva [320] and Bhīmanāyaka [321]. Of a lower status were a number of *Pradhānis* like Pōtana [322] and Koṇḍayapragaḍa [323].

---

313. *Ibid.*
314. *Ind. Ant*: XXI. pp. 117 - 202.
315. *Hyd. Arch. Ser.* No. 4.
316. S. I. I. IV. Nos. 622 and 623.
317. *Ep. Ind.* XVIII. pp. 346-356.
318. MER. 537 of 1893.
319. *Ibid.* 160 of 1899.
320. *Ibid.* 405 of 1915.
321. *Ibid.* 47 of 1929-30
322. *Ibid.* 530 of 1925.
323. *Ins. Mds. Presy.* II. Gt. 586 E.

Other Officials:—The names of many other officials are known from inscriptions e. g., Mēcayanāyaka, the *Talavari*[324], Dāmanāmatya, the *Kāryabharaṇa*[325], Vīraya[326], and Siviri Annaya[327], the *Sarvādhikāris* and Prōlarautu, the *Tantrapāla*[328].

Gaṇapatidēva passed away in 1262 A. D. after a glorious reign of 64 years. He was a fine statesman, a great conqueror and a successful administrator. He won large tracts of land by diplomacy and valour and raised the Kākatīya kingdom to the status of an empire. He brought the entire Telugu speaking area under the rule of a single paramount power and gave it a new unity and a new individuality. He blocked Yādava expansion to the south-east and checked Pāṇḍyan aggression to the north. The arrangements which he made with great foresight for the future succession to the Kākatīya throne, preserved his empire for two generations more and facilitated the further progress of the Āndhra country. He is the greatest of the Kākatīyas and one of the foremost rulers of the Dakkan in the thirteenth Century.

XIII. RUDRĀMBĀ 1260 - 1296 A. D.

Rudrāmbā succeeded to the independent sovereignty of the Kākatīya empire after the death of her father Gaṇapatidēva in 1262 A. D. One of the earliest inscriptions of her reign, a record from Tripurāntakam, dated 1261 A. D[329] mentions that this was the second regnal year of the queen, indicating thereby that her rule was reckoned even from 1260 A. D. The first ten and the last ten years of the reign were full of troubles but the queen tided over all these difficulties and maintained the integrity of the kingdom.

Several enemies and feudatories took advantage of the succession of a woman to the throne and created troubles. The Ceded Districts seem to have been the venue of disturbances.

324. *Kak. Sam.* App. p. 21 Verse. 35.
325. *Ibid.*
326. MER. 220 of 1905
327. *Ibid* 537 of 1925.
328. *Ibid* 330 and 331 of 1915.
329. MER. 194 of 1905.

The earliest of Rudrāmbā's inscriptions found at Tripurāntakam is dated 1261 A. D.[330] as stated above, and her next record bears the date 1270 A. D[331]. A number of chieftains who do not acknowledge her sovereignty figure at this place during the intervening period of nine years. Thus, for, example, the Cōḷa king, Rājēndra, is mentioned in a record[332] dated in the 15th year of his rule as making gifts at Tripurāntakam. Kopperunjinga, the later Pallava Chieftain, was also present at Tripurāntakam[333] about this time. Ēṟuva Mallidēva[334] and Siddhayadēva Cōḍa[335] are mentioned in records belonging to 1267 A. D. These chieftains were present here not as pilgrims or friends of the Kākatīyas but as enemies. Ambadēva, the famous feudatory of the Kāyastha family, is described in an inscription dated 1290 A. D. as the vanquisher of numerous rival chieftains. It is said that he defeated Śripati Gaṇapati in battle, killed Ēṟuva Mallidēva and destroyed Mallikārjuna, the enemy of gods and brāhmaṇas and Kāḍavarāya. The record enumerates some other exploits also of Ambadēva but they seem to be of a later date[336]. Śripati Gaṇapati above may be indentified with a chieftain of that name who is mentioned in an inscription from Mutkūr in the Guntūr District[337], dated 1268 A. D. He is described as a *Rāyadaṇḍādhipati* and said to be ruling in Gurindālasthala. Ēṟuva Mallidēva seems to be idantical with the chieftain of that name figuring at Tripurāntakam in 1267 A. D. The Kāḍavarāya above is obviously Kopperunjinga. A long inscription engraved on the stone wall of the Raicur fort[338], dated 1294 A. D., enumerates the exploits of Gōna Gannaya Reḍḍi, a feudatory of Rudrāmbā. Gannaya is said to have killed Kōsagi Malli, Uppulamanni, Paṇḍibhūpāla, Akkināyaka, Kāceyanāyaka and Kēśināyaka. He is also said to have defeated in battles Rāpāka Bhīma, Tērāla Kāṭa, Ēṟuvā Toṇḍa, Celu-

330. *Ibid.*

331. *Ibid.* 246 of 1905

332. *Ibid.* 201 of 1905

333. *Ibid.* 120 of 1905

334. *Ibid.* 190 of 1905

335. *Ibid.* 175 of 1905

336. MER. 268 of 1905 : See also No. 173 of the same report.

337. *Ibid.* 87 (a) of 1923–30.

338. *Kak. Sam.* App. Ins. 83.

kināyaḍu, Kōṭa Permāḍirāya and Boḍḍa Oḍaya. This Gannaya had the title *Rudradēva-dakṣiṇa-bhuja-daṇḍa*. It is likely that he earned the title by putting down the chieftains mentioned above, who must have defied the authority of the Kākatīyas about this time. In the light of all these facts, the events of the period between 1261–1268 A. D. may be arranged as follows. As soon as the retirement of Gaṇapatidēva from active politics and the assumption of the reigns of government by his daughter Rudrāmbā were proclaimed, Kopperunjinga, Rājēndra Cōḷa and Mallikārjuna rushed to Tripurāntakam with a view to attacking the southern border of the Kākatīya empire. Ambadēva opposed and repelled Mallikārjuna and the Pallava chieftain while Gannaya Reḍḍi defeated the Cōḷa. Then a number of minor chieftains of the Cudapa and Kurnūl Districts rose in revolt but were put down by these two generals. After this, Śrīpati Gaṇapati, probably a Kākatīya subordinate, and Permādirāya, a scion of the Kōṭa family defied Kākatīya authority in the Guntur District though without success. Finally, Ēṟuva Mallidēva and Siddhayadēva created trouble in the neighbourhood of Tripurāntakam. Ambadēva killed Mallidēva while according to the Local Records his brother Jannigadēva destroyed Siddhayadēva[339]. Thus Ambadēva and Gannaya Reḍḍi put down these troubles and saved the Kākatīya empire.

Another danger beset the empire from the north. The Yādava king Mahādēva is said to have attacked Rudrāmbā and humiliated her. He is described as "the whirl wind that scattered the cotton that was the ruler of the Tillinga country" and that "out of their fear of Mahādēva, the Āndhras instituted a woman as their ruler, knowing full well that he never kills a woman or a child."[340]. Still however, Mahādēva is said to have "fought with Rudrāmbā, and taken away her elephants and the five musical instruments, but spared her life because she was a woman". The traditional sources of Kākatīya history also refer to Rudrāmbā's fight with the Yādavas[341]. They mention that the king of Dēvagiri invaded the Kākatīya dominion and besieged Warangal, its capital. The queen is said to have fought wtih him for

339. *Loc. Rec.* VIII. p. 55.

340. See Hēmādri's *Vratakhaṇḍa – Rājapraśasti* verses 48 & 52.

341. See the *Pratāparudracaritramu* pp. 40–41.

one full fortnight and destroyed three lakhs of cavalry and one lakh of infantry and finally repelled him. She is also said to have pursued the retreating enemy up to Dēvagiri and obtained from him a crore of rupees as indemnity. It is therefore beyond doubt that the Yādava king Mahādēva invaded the Āndhra country. The date of this event may be determined in the light of the events already described. There were constant disturbances on the southern border of the Kākatīya empire between 1261–1268 A. D., as already stated. It is known that Mahādēva's reign ended in 1270 A. D. The Yādava invasion might have taken place between 1268–1270 A. D. There was no material change in the extent of the Kākatīya empire subsequently and the *Prātaparudrīya* of Vidyānātha mentions the humiliations and defeats of the Yādavas at the hands of Pratāparudradēva even while he was his grandmother's *Yuvarāja*.[342] Obviously, this invasion of Mahādēva was a mere passing phase which entailed no serious consequences.

There was peace in the Kākatīya empire for the nex fifteen years. The queen was therefore, free to devote her attention to acts of public benefaction. One event of great importance, mentioned by Vidyānātha as having taken place during the reign of Rudrāmbā, was the annointing of Pratāparudradēva as the *yuvarāja*. Since the earliest mention of this prince is to be found in an inscription dated 1280 A. D.[343] it may be supposed that his annointment took place about this time. Another event that may be ascribed to this period was the marriage of Rudrāmba's younger daughter Ruyyambā to Annayadēva of the Indulūri family of brāhman subordinates.

Serious troubles arose once again in the southern part of the Kākatīya empire after 1285 A. D. The Pāṇḍyas were expanding their influence and cast greedy eyes on Āndhra territory. Manmasiddhi, the Telugu Cōḍa feudatory, became involved in troubles and the Kākatīyas had to intercede on his behalf. The Hoysalas and the Yādavas, who were powerful in the Bellary District, were also waiting for an opportunity to pounce upon the Kākatīya empire. Taking

342. See the *Prataparudrīya-Nāṭakaprakaraṇa* Act II Verse 17 ; *Arthālankara prakaraṇa* Verse. 179.

343. MER. 834 of 1922.

advantage of this situation, Ambadēva allied himself with the Pāṇḍyas and the Yādavas and rose in rebellion. Pratāparudradēva, the *Yuvarāja*, tackled this dangerous situation successfully and restored peace and order. Contemporary inscriptions narrate the incidents of this episode in vivid detail. Vikrama Pāṇḍya, who came to power in 1283 A. D., is said not to have invaded the north because there was a woman with the name of a man ruling there [344]. But he is known to have been an enemy of Manmasiddhi *alias* Gaṇḍagōpāla [345]. This enemity, however, developed finally into a serious hostility. Sundara Pāṇḍya is said to have put down a number of local disturbances in the Chingelput District in 1288 A. D [346]. The injured people appealed thereon to Pottapairāja who may be identified with Manmasiddhi. This interference of Manmasiddhi seems to have brought Sundara Pāṇḍya once again to this region, for, his records are found in large numbers in the Chingelput and Cudapa Districts at this time. Curiously, no inscriptions of Manmasiddhi are to be found either in this region or at Kāncī between 1288-1290 A. D. Probably, he lost these territories to the Pāṇḍyas. This seems to have necessitated the interference of the Kākatīyas. An inscription of Ambadēva from Tripurāntakam indicates the nature of the retaliation. It is stated therein that this chieftain obtained horses and elephants from the Pāṇḍyas. He also restored at Vikramasimhapura, Manmagaṇḍagōpāla, who had lost his kingdom. Ambadēva's brother Tripurāntaka, is described as "having ruled the earth between the sea and Kāncī". Obviously, the Pāṇḍyas captured both Kāncī and Nellore early in 1290 A. D. Tripurāntaka recaptured Kāncī while Ambadēva seized Nellore and restored Manmasiddi there. This justifies his title *Rāyasthāpanācārya*. So far, things were alright. But very soon there was another trouble. The Tripurāntakam record, referred to above, mentions the further activities of Ambadēva. He is said to have defeated all the Āndhra kings in battle and given to a chieftain called Rājanna a small territory round Nandanapura along with his own daughter. In another place it is said that this Ambadēva was attended by twelve

344. MER. 128 of 1888; 329; 336 and 365 of 1913; para 30 of Pt. ii, Rept. for 1914.

345. *Ibid.* 32 of 1891

346. *Ibid.* 315 of 1909

Maṇḍalikas who lived in a fortress conquered by him. He is said, further, to have received a large number of gems and golden jewels sent by the king of Dēvagirī who was struck by his valour. The Pāṇḍyan king, who was his dear friend, sent to him strong elephants and speedy steeds and kept up friendly relations. Ambadēva's amicable relations with the Pāṇḍyas and the Yādavas, the avowed enemies of the Kākatīyas, and the absence of the mention of the Kākatīya overlord in this inscription, prove beyond doubt that soon after the restoration of Manmasiddhi, this Kāyastha chieftain threw off his allegiance to the Kākatīyas and joined their enemies. The sequel to this treachery of Ambadēva is mentioned in a number of Kākatīya records. An inscription of 1291 A. D.[347] describes Pratāparudradēva, the *Yuvarāja*, as "the lion to the elephants that were the Pāṇḍyas". Ādidamma, one of the generals of this monarch, is described in a record of 1295 A. D.[348] as the "cutter of the head of Manmagaṇḍagōpāla, the right hand of Rudradēva and the bearer of Pratāparudradēva's kingdom". Rudranapeddi, another general, is called[349] "the rescuer of the overlord's kingdom". Manmagaṇḍagōpāla, who figures as a feudatory of Pratāparudradēva, is described in an inscription of 1297 A. D. as "the burner of the capital of the Sēuṇa king" and "a fire for the drying up of the Draviḍa forces".[350] The inscription in the Raicur fort, referred to already, states that Viṭṭhalanātha, the protector of Gōna Gannaya Reḍḍi's principality, had conquered the fortresses of Ādavani, Tumbulam, Māluva and Hāluva some time before 1294 A. D, the date of that record. Two points deserve notice in this connection. Firstly, these fortresses are all situated in the Bellary District over which the Yādavas seem to be holding sway. Secondly, the Manmagaṇḍagōpāla whom Ādidamma is said to have slain, has to be identified with Manmasiddhi who is known to have had a title of that name. Two facts support this identification. Manmsiddhi's latest known mention is in an inscription at Kāncī dated 1291 A. D.[351] Another record from the same

347. MER. 82 of 1929-30.

348. *Ibid.* 176 of 1905

349. MER. 82 of 1919-30

350. S. I. I. IV. No. 661.

351. MER. 1920. p. 119.

place[351] mentions Vīragaṇḍagōpāla, a different ruler, as in possession of that city in 1294 A. D., the third year of his reign. This shows that Manmasiddhi died in 1291 A. D. and was succeeded by Vīragaṇḍagōpāla. Further, the other Manmagaṇḍagōpāla who figures as Pratāparudradēv's feudatory, was alive in 1297 A. D., and could not, therefore have been killed by Ādidamma before 1295 A. D. In view of all these facts, the sequel to Ambadēva's rebellion may be described as follows: Soon after hearing of these new Pratāparudradēva hurried to the southern border of the Kākatīya empire. He immediately despatched Viṭṭhalanātha and Manmagaṇḍagōpāla against the Yādavas. These subordinates penetrated into the Bellary District, burnt the Sēuṇa camp, captured a number of enemy fortresses and returned triumphantly. Ādidamma was sent against Manmasiddhi, who seems to have joined Ambadēva, his benefactor, and who was then at Kānci and killed him in an encounter. Pratāparudradēva himself attacked the Pāṇḍyas in the Chingelput District and defeated them. Ambadēva was chastised but forgiven. In the end Vīragaṇḍagōpāla was instituted at Kāncī and the Kākatīya forces returned home towards the end of 1291 A. D.

Mention has already been made of the part played by the feudatories of the Kāyastha, Gōna and Telugu Cōḍa families in the politics of the time. Jannigadēva and Tripurāntaka, two brothers of Ambadēva, served Rudrāmbā faithfully[353]. Manmagannaya and Annayadēva of the Indulūri family were chief ministers of the queen[354]. Guṇḍaya of the Malyāla family flourished till 1275 A. D[355]. Singayadēva Gaḍidēva[356], probably a Telugu Cōḍa chieftain, and Mādhava of the Sēuṇa family of Addanki[357] were two other loyal feudatories. Among the officials of the time Boppayadēva[358] and Rudrapragaḍa[359] were the chief ministers.

352. Sewell-H. I. S. I. p. 271. Sewell calls this chieftain Manmasiddhi III.

353. MER. 332 of 1931; 573 of 1909; Nel. Dist. Ins. D1.

354. *Kak. Sam.* App. p 13. Verses 28-30 & 43. MER. 239 of 1905.

355. *Tel. Ins.* Kak. No. 36.

356. *Nel. Dist. Ins.* D. 24.

357. Ibid. D. 72.

358. MER. 194 of 1905.

359. Nel. Dist. Ins. K. 50.

Bollināyaḍu and Parvatanāyaka[360] were the *Angarakṣas*. Nāgadēva, son-in-law of Mēcayanāyaka, the Mayor of Warangal, was the Governor of Pākanāḍu[361]. Of the valiant members of the Dāḍi family, Gannayanāyaka was the governor of Velnāḍu while Rudra and Sōmaya were famous generals[362]. A certain Mallināyaka is mentioned as *Tantrapāla*.

Rudrāmbā passed away in 1291 A. D., leaving the empire to her grandson Pratāparudradēva.

---

360. MER. 240 of 1935–36 and 130 of 1917.
361. Kak. Sām. App. p. 21 verse 35.
362. MER. 314 and 318 of 1914.

THE QUTB SHAHS

ABDUL MAJID SIDDIQUI M. A.

(Continued from Vol. I. no. i. p. 114)

From the time when he was entrusted with the governorship of the Telugu country Sultan Quli made his permanent residence here but the question arises whether he chose Golconda for his headquarters. The Qutub Shahi histories state that he chose some other place which was at a considerable distance from Golconda. Golconda was adopted as the capital of the kingdom when Sultan Quli assumed independence in 924 A. H – 1518 A. D. The Tarikh-i-Qutbia gives a clear account of the change of capital. The king devoted himself to the task of constructing the fort and the city of Golconda, after making important conquests in the Telugu country. But the situation of the mighty kingdom of Bijanagar in the neighbourhood which threatend all its neighbours was the main factor which expedited the construction of the city and the fort. The Qutub Shahi kingdom was in need of a strategic centere.[1] Although it did not command a central position in the Telugu country, it occupied a strategic position suited for resistence against the onslaughts from the Bijanagar and Ahmednagar kingdoms.

Golconda was a well known hill fort for a long time before the Qutub Shahi kingdom came into existance. It was known as "Mangal"[2] and probably served as the seat of a provincial government in the Chalukya kingdom. In the turbulous times which followed the collapse of that kingdom, Golconda became independent. It was included in the Hindu kingdom of Warangal. The fort, built by a certain Deva Roy, was originally of mud. In the middle of the fourteenth century the Bahmani Kingdom annexed Golconda. It is said that a Raja of Warangal, who was

1. *Hist. Qutb.* Shahis p. 72.
2. Golkonda is referred to as "MANGALWARAM" in the inscription set on the grave of Nawab Nekn am Khan.

the contemporary of Mohamed Shah I, was forced to cede Golconda to the latter and ever since it was under the Bahmani authority. It was an important fort and a military centre to control the eastern extremities of the kingdom as well as to supply forces for military operations whenever the need arose. When Sultan Quli was appointed governor of the Telugu country Golconda was assigned to him as a personal fief. After the death of Sultan Mahmood Bahmani in 924 A. H. - 1518 A. D. Sultan Quli transferred the seat of his independent government to Golkonda and renamed it Mahomednagar. The original fortification which existed on the top of the hill and which served the ancient Rajas as a fort was inadequate to cope with the military needs of the time. Therefore it was renewed and fortified and the city of Golconda was also laid out protected by a strong rampart round the hill.

Rajkunda was the first among the forts which Sultan Quli invested. It was a protracted siege. The fort and its ruler Venkati Naik were captured. This was followed by the seige of the strong fort of Devarkonda. The action invoked a deadly conflict with Bijanagar. With a view to stem the rising tide of the Qutub Shahi kingdom, Krishna Roy, the then Raja of Bijanagar, attacked the south-eastern boundaries of Golconda. It was resisted by the Sultan and the Bijanagar forces were put to flight. The fort of Panagal was attacked and captured despite the strong resistence offered by the local garrison. The forts of Ghanpura and Koilkunda were next captured one after another. The former is situated between Panagal and Koil-kunda and the latter was important for controlling the Krishna and Tungabhadra valleys. The Sultan returned to Golconda after this. In a few years he was compelled to resume his military operations in the east because the Raja of Khammameth had let loose his forces on the Qutub Shahi territories. Sultan Quli Qutub Shah marched to meet the aggression. The Raja met with a crushing defeat. Dastur Denar, an African Officer who held the governor ship of Gulburga in the reign of Mahmud Shah, rose in rebellion against the king. He then allied himself with the rulers of Talinghana like Mukja Ram, Ram-chander and Sri Chander. They gathered a strong army comprising of 3 lakhs infantry and twenty thousand horse.

The Sultan met this army and defeated it. This resulted in the annexation of extensive territory up to the Godavari. When the king returned to Golconda, he received an alarming report of Krishna Roy's encroachment on the Golconda territories. The Roy was opposed and the strong forts of Balamkunda and Kondaveedu were occupied. A fierce battle was fought with Hari Chander, the Raja of Nalgunda. The Qutub Shahi army laid siege to the fort and captured it after a stubborn resistence. The Sultan was successful in capturing sixty to seventy forts during a long period of thirty years and extended the limits of the kingdom from Warangal to Masulipatam [3].

Sultan Quli Qutub Shah expired in 950 A. H-1543 A. D. and his remains were interned in the "Langar Faiz Aser" [4].

V. JAMSHEED QULI

The death of Sultan Quli Shah led to a civil war among his sons. The king had six sons. [5]. The eldest, Hyder Quli, pre-disceased his father. The second son, Qutbuddin, was nominated as heir-apparent. He did not possess any kingly qualities. His younger brothers, Jamshed, Abdul Kareem and and Dulat Quli, on the other hand, were more active and enterprising. Ibrahim Quli was the sixth and the yougest of all the brothers. He showed sagacity and character superior to those of his brothers. He was, therefore, extremely loved and admired by his father. He was in charge of Devarkonda when his father died. Abdul Kareem had rebelled even during the life time of Sultan Quli but failed. He then went to Bijapur and tried unsuccessfully to gather support and finally died a miserable death in that state. Dulat Quli had probably displayed an unbecoming behaviour and was nicknamed the "Mad Prince". With a view to prevent serious mischief both Jamsheed and Dulat Quli were put in prison, one in the fort of Golconda

3. Qutub Shahi—p. 50.

4. The royal cemetry, which is situated behind the Golconda Fort, is so named because an alms house was attached to the cemetry and charity was distributed among the poor. LANGAR is an alms house.

5. Ferishta mentions only three sons, Jamsheed Quli, Hyder Quli and Ibrahim Quli.

and the other in Bhongir [6]. The latter, being confined at a distance from the central government, was utterly unable to take any active part in the conspiracy which was already a foot, but the other princes confinement in the Golconda fort turned completely in his favour. He feared his father more than his brother Qutbuddin who was an easy going and slothful prince. Jamsheed planned to despatch his father before he ventured to overthrow his brother and other claimants. Mahmood Hamdani was commissioned for the purpose. The Sultan was engaged in his evening prayer in "Masjid Safa" when he was victimised by the culprit [7]. No sooner was the report communicated to him than Jamsheed took possession of the throne and of the entire governmental machinery. As Qutbuddin was a very silent and passive member wanting real enthusiasm for the throne, he had but a few supporters to champion his cause. Jamsheed's supporters encircled the place where Qutbuddin was residing and blinded the unfortunate prince [8].

Jamsheed, whose full name was Qar Quli Jamsheed Khan, ascended the throne in 950 A. H. – 1543 A. D. under the title of Jamsheed Qutub Shah, and ruled the kingdom for seven years till 957 A. H. – 1550 A. D. Although the new king tried his utmost to please all classes of subjects by rich presents and endowments, he could not obtain the love of his subjects. He was guilty of heinous crimes. He was responsible for the murder of his father and for the blinding of his innocent brother Qutbuddin. He was also guilty of the murder of Mahmood Hamdani who had killed Sultan Quli. He had cultivated a very bigoted mind and a very narrow vision. His courtiers were tired of his sternness and harsh treatment and even their triffling offences met with heavy punishments. The kingdom was seething

6. Qutub Shahi 105.

7. Ibid. 17.

8. Ferishta gives a different version of the event. He holds that nothing but the greed of kingly power stands for the patricidal crime Ferishta notes Jamsheed as the eldest son who was not affraid of his brother, but he was exceedingly impatient to gain the throne as soon as possible, because his father still lingered on despite his advanced age. Jamsheed growing bolder in his ambition for the throne preferred resorting to quicker methods of securing the exit, of his father than leaving it to the slow process of nature.

with political discontent and responsible officials were seriously contemplating immediate change of succession. Jamsheed's younger brother Ibrahim, who was in Devarkonda, fled to Mallik Bareed in Bidar for safety and attacked Golconda in alliance with the latter. The danger was averted by the timely intervention of Burhan Nizam Shah, the king of Ahmednagar, and Ibrahim Quli was forced to fly to Bijanagar. Jamsheed proceeded to Ahmadnagar in order to express his thanks to the Nizam Shahi king. He was accorded a stately reception and was presented with a royal umbrella, an Aftab Giri and the royal title of Shah. Burhan Nizam Shah contemplated at the time an invasion of Sholapur and sought Jamsheed's cooperation. He also secured the help of Imadul - Mulk. The allies stormed Sholapur in 951 H.-1544 A. D. In order to divert their attention Ibrahim Adil Shah attacked Parenda which was then under the Nizam Shahis. Ibrahim had, on his side, Barid and his armies. In the battle that ensued the Adil Shahi forces offered stubborn resistence but they could not stand the heavy onslaughts of the Qutb Shahi forces led by Jamsheed. Consequently, Ibrahim's forces were forced to retreat. Barid was pursued by Jamsheed as far as Bidar.

But Ali Barid remembered this defeat and prepared for revenge. He attacked Golconda in 952 H. - 1545. Leaving his commanders in charge of the defence of Golconda, Jamsheed attacked Bidar. Informed of this, Ali marched towards Bidar. The belligerents met at a place between Patencheru and Calupgur. In the battle that ensued Jamsheed won.

Undaunted by this defeat Barid allied with Ibrahim Adil Shah of Bijapur, and attacked Madak Fort in 953 H.-1546 A. D. He obtained a loot of 40 elephants and seven thousand huns. Jamsheed retaliated by plundering Kolas. Baried came to oppose him with 8000 men and a severe battle took place near Nerain Khaer. A son of Ainul-Mulk deserted Baried and joined Jamsheed's forces. During a brief respite Jamsheed went to see the fort newly constructed by Jagadeswrai, a general of his. Barid took advantage of his absence and launched a sudden attack. The defeated Golconda army fled a to Kolas. Jamsheed

soon returned and attaked Barid, who fled to Bidar. Jamsheed occupied Kolas fort, reorganised the territory and put in under Jagadeswrai's supervision.

Though Barid was successively defeated, yet his frequent attacks were the source of annoyance and Golconda had always to be on its guard. After coming to Golconda, Jamsheed pondered over the problem. He consulted Burhan Nizam Shah and induced him to put an end to Barid with a plea of common interest. They made a plan and agreed to encirle Barid's kingdom and to attack him from all sides. Consequently in 953 H. - 1546 A. D., Burhan attacked the Ausa fort and Audgir, and Jamsheed reached Kolas with his mighty army. Jamsheed and his ally Burhan met at Ausa and exchanged greetings. They then attacked Medak. Burhan's ally, the Imad Shah, took Ausa and Audgir. Barid sought the help of Bijapur. General Ikhlas Khan was sent by Ibrahim Adil Shah with an army five thousand strong and marched towards Kolas with Barid. Jamsheed attacked the enemy bravely attended by Shafqat Khan Ainul - Mulk and Jagdeswari. Barid was defeated and ran away to Bidar. Jamsheed obtained good loot and he returned to Golconda. (Tarikh-e-Qutub Shahi, pp. 121-122). He realised, however, that Barid would not accept this defeat and that Bijapur would readily help him. He therefore induced Burhan Nizam Shah to alienate Barid and Ibrahim Adil Shah. Burhan wrote to Ibrahim Adil Shah that Barid was the cause of political unrest and that the peace of Deccan was disturbed by his evil ambitions. He pleaded for the uprooting of Barid's power. Ibrahim soon agreed to this proposal and made an alliance with Ahmadnagar and Golconda. The plan was that the Nizam Shah should attack Khandhar which was a stronghold in the state of Bidar and that Ibrahim should attack Vijianagar. In 954 H.-1547 A. D. Burhan launched an attack against Khandar. Barid ran to Bijapur for aid but Ibrahim arrested him instead of extending a helping hand. Ibrahim then proceeded against Vijianagar.

Unfortunately Ahmadnagar and Bijapur soon drifted into war. The recent conquests of Bijapur in the southern kingdom of Vijianagar increased the power of the Adil

Shah and Burhan became apprehensive. He attacked Sholapur in order to divert the attention of Ibrahim. Both rulers requested Jamsheed Qutub Shah's help. Barid appealed for relief from his confinement at Bijapur. Jamsheed assured the Adil Shahi envoy of his full co-operation provided Barid was set free. On the advise of his well-wishers the king returned with Barid. He halted for a few days at Bidar and finally reached Golconda. After returning from Bidar, Jamsheed waged no more wars [9]. In the early part of 1550 A. D. he was attacked by a serious disease, described by Ferishta as tuberculosis and by the Qutub Shahi historians as cancer, and died in 957 H.–1550 A. D.

19166

---

9. Ferishta gives an exaggerated account of the events. He tells us that Jamsheed on this occasion had invaded Adil Shahi territories in support of Ahmadnagar and had succeeded in constructing for himself a new fort in Kokan. Ibrahim was bound first to conclude peace with Ramraja of Vijianagar and then to meet Jamsheed. Jamsheed was defeated and was pursued by Asad Khan Lari, the famous Adil Shahi general, to the limits of Golconda Fort.-and sustained injuries. Ferishta further says that Jamsheed lost his life in the warfare to the extent that he was barred from taking his meals in public. But the statement is not corroborated by the histories of Golconda. This seems to be an over-statement of Ferishta in praise of Bijapur, and Asad Khan Lari. (Ferishta, p. 169.)

Printed by :
A. NAGESWARA RAO
AT THE SARASWATHI POWER PRESS
RAJAHMUNDRY